

June 10, 1965

which are paid for by the Richmond County Board of Education.

"We would have had to shut down about four classes last year if this rule had been in effect then," Hardy said. "The taxpayers spent over \$1 million to build technical training facilities in Richmond County. Why aren't they being used?"

It can't be for the lack of trying.

OPPORTUNITY

"We've been to every Georgia high school in the CSRA—telling them of the opportunity here," Hardy said. "We've taken students on tour here. Six thousand first-class letters have been mailed to Richmond County high school graduates since January."

Despite these efforts, there have been only 25 applications from Richmond County graduates for admission to the school in September. Butler High has 5, Richmond Academy 10, and Hephzibah High, 10.

Most of the applications come from outside the county. One student in St. George, Maine, wants to come in September to study automotive mechanics. Another in Syracuse, N.Y., wants to take a course in data processing.

APPLIED

In all, 98 out-of-county students have applied for the classes beginning in the fall, Hardy said.

"We could use another 225 applications—to insure that the school is filled up," he added.

Now going into its fifth year, Augusta Tech began this school year with 125 students.

"It should have been 300," Hardy said.

Augusta Tech's director said he is worried about the future of the county's youth. Of the 1,200 graduating from high school this month, about 600 will go to college. Hardy said 48 percent of these 600 will never graduate.

The question is, What happens to these 900 who are not destined to become college graduates?

"I'd like to run a study to find out what happened to them," Hardy said. "I'm sure that a lot of them are in low-paying jobs with no future."

Hardy blames the lack of students at Augusta Tech on "parental apathy." He said teenagers about to enter the labor market especially need counseling from their parents.

"They can't take 30 minutes to come out here and see what we've got," he said. "Life isn't so busy yet that parents don't have time to help plan the future of their boy or girl."

For the students who do take advantage of Augusta Tech, the future is bright. Twenty-one night students graduated last week in drafting and electronic technology. Every one either received a promotion in his work or got a better job as a result of his training.

After completing a course of study at Augusta Tech, finding a job is almost a sure thing. Hardy could place hundreds of graduates if he only had them.

Hardy said there are two possibilities if enrollment at the school doesn't increase. "Augusta Tech can either be financed through local taxation, or it can be turned into a junior high school," he said. "But what would we accomplish there?"

He said there is nothing to hold students back. There is a small supply fee and the students pay for their books, but these costs will be paid for the student if he cannot afford it.

"If Rome and Albany can fill their schools up, why can't we fill ours up," Hardy asked. "The people in Augusta need training just as much as they do in other parts of the State."

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle,
June 2, 1965]

OPPORTUNITY DOWN THE DRAIN?

If Augusta were about to lose an industry on which the jobs of hundreds or thousands of wage earners depended, the entire community would be aroused to action.

Augusta and the entire CSRA within commuting distance is on the verge of a comparable loss—not of a plant itself, but of a training facility which provides the skills necessary to bring plants here, and keep them supplied with highly trained staffs.

We can lose the Augusta area technical school for lack of enrollment, Director George M. Hardy said Tuesday, because the State of Georgia has issued a directive which says costs will not be paid in any class which does not have at least 12 students enrolled initially.

If this were an expensive school, with high tuition, the slow pace of enrollment might be understandable. It is State supported, however, with students paying only a small fee for supplies, and paying for their books. If a student is in straitened financial circumstances, even these minor costs will be paid for him.

The need on the part of city and area youths for the kind of training which the technical school provides is obvious. Of 1,200 high school graduates in this county, only about 600 of them go to college, and approximately half of that number do not graduate, says Director Hardy. That means that three-fourths of our high school graduates do not get the professional and business training of a full college course.

What will they do? Perform menial, ill-paying tasks the rest of their lives? Be passed over when promotions and pay increases are awarded? Struggle a little way up the ladder to success, then be the first demoted or fired when business is bad? Go into industrial scrap heap if wages costs go so high that automation replaces the unskilled labor?

The State of Georgia spent more than \$1 million to build technical schools in Richmond County. Their work is highly effective. Graduates of Augusta Technical School have almost a certainty of getting a job, Director Hardy saying he could place hundreds of graduates if only he had them. Twenty-one night students in drafting and electronic technology were graduated last week, and as a result every one received a promotion or got a better job.

Similar schools in Albany and Rome are filling up their classes. Here, however, only 25 applications from Richmond County for admission in September have been received. Out-of-county applications number 98, for a total application list of 123. The school could admit another 225 students.

Had the rule on a minimum of 12 students per class been in effect last year, four classes would have been discontinued.

This is a serious situation which means a great deal to the future of young people now at the crossroads. With the school, they have a golden opportunity. Should it be closed for lack of interest, they may be handicapped the rest of their lives.

The danger is of great concern to the community as well. There can be no doubt that the success of Augusta Technical School will be a factor, far into the future, in bringing to this area industries which depend on local training for the skilled people they need.

Both individuals and community have a tremendous stake in the success and continued operation of this school.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the argument continues, both in this Chamber

and in the press, as well as around our Nation, about America's future course in South Vietnam. We are told we must declare a state of war, or, at least, specifically authorize the offensive use of U.S. troops in southeast Asia.

In truth, Congress has already given President Johnson a firm endorsement of his policy in Vietnam, which is a policy of "firmness with moderation." The determination of our President and our Nation to withstand the Communist onslaught in Vietnam is unchanged, although the role played by ground forces remains chiefly defensive.

Large segments of the press have served their function well in analyzing, for the American people, the situation and the debate. On Wednesday, the Washington Star, in an editorial, talked back to critics of our strategic bombing policy who claim it has not succeeded. As the Star pointed out, that fact does not mean that it has failed. There are many indications that the Communists realize that time is running out for them. Today, the Washington Post cleared the air by stating editorially that, despite much recent speculation and debate about future moves, the administration has simply reaffirmed America's determination not to abandon South Vietnam to Communist conquest.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, June 9, 1965]

ESCALATION IN VIETNAM?

Maxwell Taylor's return to Washington for periodic consultations coincides with the announcement that the United States has once again upped the ante in Vietnam. From now on, American troops are to be authorized to engage in combat operations along with Vietnamese forces when and as they are needed.

This is another indication that the war on the ground in Vietnam has entered a critical phase at the onset of the monsoon season. And it is another sign of American determination to make whatever commitment may be necessary to prevent a Communist military victory in the coming months.

Taylor's visit also coincides with mounting pressure for a further escalation of the war in the north. In Saigon, the Government is reported to be urging stepped-up American air attacks against industrial installations in the Hanoi-Haiphong area and even on Hanoi itself as a means of forcing North Vietnam to call off its efforts in the south.

The present policy of limiting the attacks to military targets and infiltration routes, it is said, has failed to produce the desired results. More serious damage would persuade Hanoi that we mean business. It would stiffen sagging morale in South Vietnam and strengthen the shaky regime of Premier Phan Huy Quat.

These arguments need careful evaluation. Taylor himself—along with virtually all responsible officials in Washington—is reported to be firmly opposed to the indiscriminate bombing of civilian populations. And the value of attacks against other essentially nonmilitary targets must be weighed in terms of their real effect on the fighting in the south.

Apart from any other considerations, the real deterrent to North Vietnam is the threat that industries and communications may be destroyed. Once they are gone Ho Chi Minh will be quite literally in a position of having

nothing more to lose no matter what happens in the south. This fact, combined with adverse reaction around the world and the probability of greatly increased Russian and Chinese support, casts considerable doubt on the wisdom of playing all of our trump cards at this particular time.

Nor is there any reason to assume that the present limited schedule of attacks is without deterrent effect on the Hanoi government. The fact that it has not succeeded yet does not mean that it has failed. There are many indications that the Communists realize that time is running out and are gambling heavily on a decisive military victory on the ground before it does. The time for drastic decisions—in both Hanoi and Washington—will come after the critical summer months.

[From the Washington Post, June 10, 1965]
COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

The White House statement of yesterday does not change the fact that American forces in Vietnam may now be used in regular fighting alongside the Vietnamese if the American commander deems it to be necessary. In this comment on a previous announcement that had come out of the State Department the White House insists that no new order has been given to General Westmoreland. Nevertheless, the current statements give the public a somewhat different understanding of the policy than had been given in previous official discussion of it.

As we understand the order that has been given, American troops in South Vietnam will not engage in general combat. Their primary duty is the patrolling of important military installations and the adjacent areas. But within the scope of this mission they may fight with Vietnamese troops when the latter are aggressively attacked, if the Vietnamese commander requests it and the American commander thinks that the military situation requires it. Undoubtedly this will mean some further involvement of American forces in the Vietnamese war than the public had previously contemplated.

Yet the basic problem in Vietnam has not changed. Nor has the basic policy of this Government. The administration has merely indicated in more explicit terms that it is following a somewhat flexible policy of helping the South Vietnamese resist the aggression from their northern neighbors.

Six weeks ago President Johnson described his policy as one of "firmness with moderation." That is still an accurate description. What has happened since then is an intensification of the Vietcong's efforts to strike a series of climactic blows at South Vietnam. In response the United States has continued to bomb supply lines in North Vietnam and has stepped up its patrolling operations and resistance to attacks in the vicinity of military bases. Yet the U.S. commitment remains limited. In purpose it will remain defensive.

In effect the administration has reaffirmed its determination not to abandon South Vietnam to Communist conquest. This is a policy that appears to have strong national backing. Congress recently voted overwhelmingly to support the continuation of aid to South Vietnam in its fight for survival, and this determination will not waver because the struggle in that unhappy land is undergoing some measure of transformation.

The dangers involved in this course are well known in the White House, in the State Department and in virtually every American home. But the perils of each new step that is taken have to be measured against the perils of not taking it. Painful though the decision is, the continuation of a strong posture of resistance to aggression in South Vietnam still appears to be less dangerous than either defeat or withdrawal. For such

a victory for militant communism would doubtless bring an escalation of armed aggression on a broad scale, with a graver menace for both peace and freedom.

Secretary of State Rusk took occasion to reiterate the eagerness of the United States to join in peace negotiations. Some wishful thinkers are saying that Hanoi cannot be expected to negotiate so long as the United States is bombing its territory. But the entire history of the Vietnamese affair indicates that Hanoi is even less inclined to talk when the pressure is relaxed.

The United States is trying to show the North Vietnamese that they cannot dictate the terms of a settlement by the continued use of force and violence against their neighbors. However disagreeable and costly that task may be, it still seems to involve less risk to our freedom and security than any form of knuckling under to the Communist threat in Vietnam.

MEXICAN CHILDREN IN NEW MEXICO SCHOOLS

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, we in Congress who vote billions of dollars every year for foreign aid rarely have the opportunity to see anything but the "big picture."

Today, I would like to tell Senators about a "little picture" in my home State of New Mexico which will make a number of Mexican citizens lifelong friends and supporters of the United States.

Since 1910, Mexican youngsters from the border village of Palomas have been crossing the international boundary every day to attend school in Columbus and Deming, N. Mex. Many walk a mile or more.

The citizens of Deming and Columbus have always welcomed this arrangement, and the Mexican children and their parents have, of course, been pleased with the opportunity to attend our schools.

The children pay \$2 a month, and the rest of the cost has traditionally been absorbed by the taxpayers of Luna County, N. Mex., as a neighborly gesture toward their friends across the border.

Sixty-seven children are involved this year.

Last month, the New Mexico attorney general ruled that this arrangement is illegal, and said the Mexican youngsters' educational costs must be paid in full if they are to continue going to our schools. That would mean \$400 a year per child, or more, and few families could afford that.

This ruling was very disturbing to many people.

The Albuquerque Journal ran an editorial titled, very fittingly, "Good Will That's Illegal."

The editorial commented that "it would be regrettable if some method could not be worked out to continue, perhaps under Federal sponsorship, this fine, hands across the border project. This is one program on which foreign aid dollars could be spent without arousing controversy."

The editorial reflected the view of many people. Two who worked particularly hard to find a solution were our State superintendent of public instruction, Mr. Leonard J. De Layo, and State Senator I. M. Smalley, of Deming.

I asked the State Department to see whether these youngsters' education

could be paid for through AID funds, and ran into a barrage of what seem to me rather superficial objections. To state it briefly, State took the position that such a contribution would set a costly precedent, and that Mexico would resent such an action on our part anyway.

It was left to the New Mexico School Budget Board to come to the rescue. On June 2, the board voted a special \$25,000 appropriation from general State funds to take care of the Palomas children next year.

This fine gesture in international goodwill is a statewide gesture, and I want Senators to know, how proud I am of the people of my State.

In conclusion, I must say that we have probably not heard the last of this matter. This State appropriation is a stop-gap measure, and it will probably be necessary to change State law if we are to continue to help the Palomas children after next year.

In the meantime, I hope the U.S. State Department will keep an open mind on this subject, because it may develop eventually that Federal aid is the only permanent solution.

It would be folly to let such a fine program die for lack of what is, after all, only a small amount of money when we consider the international good will which is involved.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the advancing pace of our daily lives makes us more than ever aware that if we are to continue to progress as a people, we must be willing and able to prepare our youth to accept these complex responsibilities. It is to this end that the proposed Higher Education Act of 1965 is directed.

This bill takes cognizance of the fact that we must look to every segment of our youthful population in order to find the responsible leaders of the future. This country may no longer rely on the development of educated citizens from only those who come primarily from the higher income families. Talents are measured, not by economic background, but by the opportunity and the ability to produce. This opportunity must be available to all. The provisions of this bill make it possible for all those of ability to be eligible for a college education. Although this is an admirable and a significant advance, it does not do the whole job.

As you know, Mr. President, Gov. Richard J. Hughes, of New Jersey, has always been vitally interested in the expansion of our educational programs. When testifying before the Subcommittee on Education, of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Governor Hughes described his philosophy as follows:

I believe that the concept of the academic community as a vital component of the general community is both visionary and sound.

It is with this thought in mind that I ask that the Governor's remarks be

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12743

saddest sights in the world is the dilapidated farmstead that stands where a farm family used to live. And we're getting more and more of them in South Dakota—about 1,000 each year—because our farmers aren't getting an adequate reward for their productive skills.

I'm sure you agree that something needs to be done about this worsening situation, and I know this committee will do whatever is possible to do to reverse the trend toward rural depression. But from what I've read and seen, I've concluded that the greatest obstacle to decent farm legislation is the fact that many people apparently don't think parity of income is worth what it would cost—either to the consumer or to the taxpayer. And I'd like to say a few words about that.

As you well know, there are only two sources from which the producer of food can get increased income and prices—from the consumer, through the market, or from the taxpayer, through direct payments. The opponents of farm programs contend that if you get it from the taxpayer, it's an unwarranted subsidy. And they say that if you get it from the consumer it's a "bread tax" which our consumers shouldn't have to pay.

We can only conclude that those who preach both of these lines at the same time don't want increased farm income at all.

So we've got to make the decision that there is no other source—at least a visible one—for more farm income other than the consumer, or the taxpayer's pocket. And then we must decide if it's needed, warranted, and worth the expense.

I firmly believe that it is. From the standpoint of need, I don't think we need to do more than look at the number of farm failures each year and the number of rural businesses that are forced to close their doors. In a nation where there aren't enough jobs to go around, it's imperative that we keep productive members of society, rather than unemployed living on the tax rolls of our towns and cities.

And I certainly believe that increased farm income is warranted—and deserved. The information compiled in the pamphlet, entitled "Food Costs—Farm Prices," put out by the House Committee on Agriculture includes the fact that last year consumers in this country paid about \$69 billion for farm-produced food. That's a big chunk of money. But even when you add the cost of Federal farm programs to that figure, it still comes to only 19.5 percent of the average family's income. This figure, standing alone, is rather meaningless, but when you compare it with corresponding figures in other countries, it is truly amazing. Great Britain has the next lowest food cost in relation to personal income. Consumers there, according to the latest United Nations figures, spend 29.5 percent of their incomes for food. In France they spend 30.6 percent, and in Russia they spend 53 percent.

Now, I've done a little calculating, and I've determined that if consumers in the United States had to spend as much of their incomes for food as in the next lowest country—Great Britain—the food bill here last year would have been something like \$104 billion instead of \$69 billion—or \$35 billion more than it was.

To look disparagingly at "subsidies" in light of this is, to me, nothing short of ridiculous. The "subsidy" as I see it is clearly going in the other direction—from the farmer to the consumer—and it's about the biggest subsidy there is in this country. The farmer is truly subsidizing the consumer.

Now, I don't know what share of their incomes consumer should rightly pay for food. I don't think that even with full parity income consumers in the United States would have to pay as much as they do in Great Britain. But I do say that the part

of the food dollar that goes to the farmer is, in absolute terms, far too low in this country, and that a substantial increase is not only warranted but is an obligation. I'm 100 percent for the lowest cost, highest quality food we can provide, but it is wrong to keep the cost of food low by forcing those who produce it into bankruptcy.

And let me note here that the food industry, beyond the farm—particularly the retailers—have taken a great deal of credit for the low-cost food we do have, and that most of this credit—and dubious credit it is—belongs to the farmer. If he wasn't forced to produce on meager margins and losses, the cost of food would have kept pace with the cost of everything else.

Finally, I'd like to express my opinion that higher farm income is an urgent need not only from the standpoint of the farmer, but from the standpoint of the consumer and the broad national interest.

I've already pointed out that food costs are unbelievably low in this country in comparison to the rest of the world. This Nation is, I am sure, the envy of the world because of our food abundance and the amazing ability of our family farmers to produce enough, and too much food. We are unique in having this problem of surpluses. Many other countries, I'm sure, wish they had the same problem.

But it's my contention that we won't have this surplus problem very long—and we won't have the low-cost food, either—if we lose, as we are losing now, the family farmers who produce it and if they are replaced by corporate factories in the field.

I am supported in this statement by what is happening in other countries. In Latin America, for example, something closely akin to the corporate farm in that most of the people merely work on and do not own the land they farm. And these countries are importers, not exporters, of food.

Or let's look at the Soviet Union. From the farmworker or producers' standpoint, there's not a great deal of difference between working for a collective farm or a corporate farm. And over there they've had to swallow their pride, admit their failure, and look to free countries for food.

So I don't think there's any question of our need to maintain the family farm system. And the only way this can be done is to substantially strengthen farm income. Our group statement which Mr. Radcliffe has presented indicates in general terms what steps we believe should be taken to accomplish this end. It is my fervent hope that this committee will act in that direction, and will help in this way to avert economic disaster in rural America.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to appear before you.

STATEMENT OF C. E. POLLARD

The farmers in South Dakota have been caught in the long-term cost-price squeeze and are being "squeezed" as hard if not harder, than in most other sections of the country because of the lack of alternate opportunities for employment off the farm. We should remember that the parity index for agricultural commodities has reached 100 percent only twice during the last half century, and that was during a time of war when restrictions were placed upon farm prices to prevent us from recovering from the losses which we had sustained during previous years.

At the present time, the parity index is standing steady at 74, having dropped from 100 at the beginning of 1953 steadily downward. In an attempt to compensate for decreased prices, farmers have turned to technology and mechanization. Unfortunately, the expansion of the productive plant has not been followed by adequate compensation. As a result, the capitalization, both in land and in the assets of production, or the non-

real-estate loans, has been increasing steadily.

The farm mortgage debt nationally has increased from an index of 100 in 1950, to 249 in 1962. The non-real-estate debt index has increased from 100 to 235 during the same period. All debt has increased from 100 to 362 during this 12-year period; however, the production assets have increased only from 100 to 277. In other words, during this 12-year period, the debt index increased by 262 points, and the asset increased by 177.

What has happened to all of us very simply, is that we have been living off of our inventories, we have been existing because we have reduced our standards of living by reducing our purchases for those items which most segments of our economy call necessities, such as higher education for our children. More important is the fact that we have been substituting credit and borrowing for earnings. This simply cannot go on forever.

Our country banks are loaning up to their legal capacity at the present time. The demand for cash in order to continue business, has been so great that a number of them are discounting their short-term farm paper for as low as 96 percent, in order to get this capital. Total farm debt at the present time held by reporting institutions has increased from \$2,834 million in 1950, to \$9,465 million in 1964. Nonreporting institutions, including dealers, finance companies, etc., are holding debts of \$6,720 million at the end of 1964, up from \$2,320 million in 1950.

That this presents an economic hazard to our total community is indicated by the fact that had agricultural income continued to rise, after 1952, at the same rate that it did in the previous 12 years and as the non-agricultural segments of our economy did, net spendable farm income would have been \$108 billion in excess of that which was actually received. This would be in excess of the total favorable balance of trade of all exports during this same period of time.

What this has meant in terms of jobs that have not been filled, due to declining purchases of agricultural machinery and hard capital goods, is difficult to estimate. It is safe to say that it represents the difference between a booming economy and one which is barely able to keep ahead of the next recession.

Farmers are not asking for charity. They do not want to go on welfare. They do not ask for special treatment as "special" people, with special privileges. What they do ask for is adequate, and equitable, returns for their labor, their investment, their managerial ability, and their risk, that is comparable to that which would be returned for these same economic factors in any other segment of the economy. Self-survival demands no less. The general welfare cannot afford any less than this equity. Speaking for the grange in South Dakota, I would say that we are going to oppose any program that will reduce farm income and we will look with favor on any program which will maintain and improve farm income.

"A CATTLEMAN'S VIEW" STATEMENT BY GEORGE LEVIN, COCHAIRMAN OF THE CATTLE PARITY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, my name is George Levin. I live at Newell, in the heart of the cattle country. We are in the cattle business.

I speak as a citizen and as cochairman of cattle parity committee.

The long and relentless deterioration of farm income towers over other aspects of the farm problem as Washington Monument towers over Arlington. The underpayment in agriculture has had a tremendous depressing effect on the economy of the State of South Dakota. Since 1950, we have lost about \$5.5 billion. This \$5.5 billion could have been earned without flexing one more

muscle, without investing one more penny, without building one more factory, without employing one more worker. We already had the production. All we needed was a price increase in farm products in relation to the increase in the cost of operating expenses. This \$5.5 billion is lost forever to the State of South Dakota. It can never be recovered.

Because this price increase was not forthcoming, we have witnessed a 300 percent increase in the national farm debt, from \$12 dollars in 1950 to \$36 billion today. Farmers and ranchers had no choice but to substitute credit for the loss in earned net income. This situation has brought country banks near the end of their credit limitations. Soon these banks will be forced to begin curtailing loans to farmers and ranchers. Some already have begun. As I was leaving, word came to me that one of my neighbors had been called in for a showdown. He is a young, energetic, and capable rancher with a good substantial operation, but that alone isn't enough. It takes price, too, you know. Who will be next we don't know but over 90 percent of the ranchers are deeply in debt. Many thousands stand on the brink of disaster as I speak to you today.

This persistent decline in net farm income is no longer just a problem of the producers of agricultural producers alone. This was brought home very forcefully to us last week in the little town of Newell in western South Dakota near where I live. A businessman found that he was no longer able to keep his doors open. He proceeded to dispose of his place of business at auction. Though the chant of the auctioneer rang loud and clear, no one offered a bid. A lifetime of work and investment had been rendered valueless. The relentless downward spiral in net farm income had chained another victim on main street.

It is my firm conviction that if remedial action is not taken at once by the Congress to bring justice to the people in agriculture this persistent decline in net income will continue to increase at an accelerated pace. Eventually it will have an adverse effect on the national economy of such magnitude as to halt this extended period of economic expansion that the country as a whole is experiencing and plunge us headlong into serious economic depression.

The old adage that depressions are farmed and farm fed still holds true today.

I agree with Senator McGovern that "either we devise a formula for generating at least \$5 billion of increased net income in agriculture or we will see the collapse of much of our rural economy, the steady exodus of farm families from the land and an acceleration of urban congestion and unemployment." Unless we do this and even more we cannot hope to make any progress in the direction of retiring this huge national farm debt. We will see 20 million people leaving rural areas and moving to the cities. This is neither economically or socially desirable.

From my understanding of the policies being projected, production for export at world market prices will soon replace adequate price support programs as the answer to the farm problem. I don't think that the producers of agricultural products should be required to underwrite the cost of the foreign policy of this country. We have demonstrated in the past that we are willing to do our share but we should not be expected to carry the whole load.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that price is our main problem as I stated in my opening remarks. This problem can only be solved by bringing justice and parity to people in agriculture. In times past, cattlemen who produce feeder cattle have voiced strong opposition to price support programs but 2 years of low cattle prices has convinced most of them of the need for some type of

legislation to alleviate the situation. The success of the petition campaign for a Federal cattle program initiated by the cattle parity committee bears witness to this fact. Ranchers, large and small alike, joined wholeheartedly with us in our efforts to petition the Congress for a Federal cattle program patterned in principle after the wool incentive program.

"I used to think we didn't need a Federal program for cattle but the last 2 years has sure changed my mind" is an oft repeated remark by producers as we visited with them about the situation.

The solution is as obvious as it is simple. We must improve and expand the Federal farm programs to reflect 100 percent for all livestock products. Including cattle with a family farm cutoff built in. Our failure to act will invite tragedy to rural America. It is already in progress.

THE REASONS FOR OUR COMMITMENTS IN VIETNAM AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, an editorial in the *Trentonian* of May 10 ably states the reasons for our commitments in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Recent events in these two countries have a common theme—that of Communist aggression; and not, as some may believe, U.S. intervention. Our action in these two places of world crisis continues to be for the purpose of thwarting the offensive action of Communist nations.

The interests of this country are challenged directly by Communist military action in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. The aggressive Communist philosophy threatens the peace and security of our own hemisphere. We have only to look at the most glaring manifestation of the Communist success—in Cuba—to realize that this is a real, not an imaginary, evil. Therefore, I ask that the editorial be printed at this point in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

LET'S NOT FORGET WHO INTERVENED FIRST

(By J. Willard Hoffman, editor of the *Trentonian*)

Too many Americans have never really understood why Americans are fighting and dying in Vietnam.

Now, too many don't understand why Americans are fighting and dying in the Dominican Republic.

Perhaps they don't understand because they, like all of us, hate wars—whether they be big or little or declared or undeclared—and therefore refuse to accept the fact that there is any justification for armed action by this Nation.

Or perhaps it is because they don't recognize the threat of communism for what it really is.

In any event, they should be able to grasp the fact that Americans are fighting in Vietnam because they are fighting communism; and they are fighting in Santo Domingo because they are fighting communism.

Here at home, some commentators and some elected officials may rant and rave about President Johnson's sending the marines into the Dominican Republic being an unilateral and illegal action, but they conveniently ignore the fact that the Communists intervened first.

For too long the policy of nonintervention in Latin American affairs has been a

joke; all it meant was that the United States could not intervene, but the Communists could infiltrate and subvert wherever they could and whenever they could.

So it was in the Dominican Republic. It is a matter of indisputable record that more than 50 trained Communist agents—most of them from Cuba, but others from Russia, China, and other Communist countries—slipped into the Dominican Republic. Subsequently they took advantage of a governmental breakdown, aroused the people, passed out arms, and did everything possible to reap the benefits of civilian unrest.

Even if our Government had not known beforehand of Communist plans for a takeover of the Dominican Republic, it soon became clear that that was exactly what the uprising was all about.

What was the United States to do? Stand by and implore the Organization of American States to get moving, then find the hemisphere with another Castro-type regime in power?

Of course not. President Johnson did what he had to do at the only time that he could hope to do it and achieve success. His excuse at first was, of course, to protect and rescue Americans and other foreign nationals. But it soon became clear that his real purpose was to prevent the creation of another Castro Cuba. He intervened, but only after the Communists had intervened first.

The Reds started another phony "war of liberation"—the same kind of "war of liberation" they are waging to try to take over South Vietnam. President Johnson decided to thwart them before he found himself with another Cuba and another Vietnam on his hands.

As for Vietnam, let's pay attention to what Secretary of State Rusk said recently in an address:

"Let us be clear about what is involved today in southeast Asia. We are not involved with empty phrases or conceptions which ride upon the clouds. We are talking about the vital national interests of the United States in the peace of the Pacific. We are talking about the appetite for aggression—an appetite which grows upon feeding, and which is proclaimed to be insatiable. We are talking about the safety of nations with whom we are allied—and the integrity of the American commitment to join in meeting attack."

Let us not delude ourselves into thinking that the way to avoid world war III is to let aggressive communism run rampant. Such delusions paved the way for World War II.

THE FARM-INCOME CRISIS IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, today, nearly 200 South Dakota farmers, bankers, and businessmen are in Washington, because of their deep concern about farm income, the continuing and steady failure of farm operators, the disappearance of farming units, the subsequent disappearance from rural towns of stores and business establishments, and, inevitably, the decline of the towns, themselves.

This morning, the group submitted to several of us, for inclusion in the record of the hearings on farm legislation, statements by five or six of the members of the group. Their statements graphically tell the story of a declining rural America.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* the statements by Mr. Ben Radcliffe, president of the

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12745

South Dakota Farmers Union; and by Mr. Ernest Johnson, the secretary of agriculture for South Dakota.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE SOUTH DAKOTA RURAL LOBBY—SUBMITTED BY MR. BEN RADCLIFFE, PRESIDENT, SOUTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION

The farm economy of South Dakota and other rural States is approaching a major crisis. So serious is the situation that unless immediate steps are taken to improve farm income, a farm depression may soon be upon us. This, in turn, could result in a general recession that would seriously endanger the economy of the entire Nation.

Numbers tell only part of the story, but they are extremely meaningful:

While gross farm income in South Dakota has been increasing somewhat, higher production costs have been cutting deeper and deeper into meager profits. According to the South Dakota Crop and Livestock Reporting Service, net farm income in the State in 1963 was \$35.4 million below the most recent 5-year average.

Although final net income figures for 1964 are not yet available, total cash receipts from farm marketings dropped another \$12 million last year. If the growth in production expenses averaged the same as in the previous 10 years, the total drop in net income will amount to about \$28 million.

The 1960 census showed that median family income in nearly a third of South Dakota's counties was below the poverty level of \$3,000 per year. Significantly, these counties generally represent the most agricultural areas and much of the best farmland in the State.

The steady decline in net income has caused a continuing migration from the farm. In 1931 there were 84,300 farms and ranches in South Dakota. In 1950 there were 67,100. Last year the number had dropped to 54,000. Since 1955 the drop has been 16 percent. Assuming that an average farm family has 4 members, 38,000 people have left South Dakota farm homes in the last decade.

The forced exodus from our farms has had an obvious effect upon our cities and towns. A generally accepted ratio is that for every 12 farms that disappear, one rural business place must close its doors. The main streets of hundreds of our rural communities bear witness to this attrition.

To improve the economic status of agriculture and to avert the very real possibility of a rural depression and the human hardships that would go with it, we ask for action now. The economic plight of America's great heartland will continue to worsen unless immediate steps are taken to substantially improve farm income.

We urge the Congress and the appropriate administrative agencies to act quickly to strengthen programs that directly affect farm prices and income. The following are the goals that must be sought and the means that should be used to attain them:

I. Increasing farm cash receipts through:

(A) Higher certificate values and price supports for wheat and feed grains in 1965 and in subsequent years.

(B) An administrative decision to keep CCC sales of wheat and feed grains for unrestricted use to a minimum, thereby creating upward pressures on market prices.

(C) Administrative action to boost exports of farm commodities.

(D) Immediate action for a long-range, balanced, all-commodity farm program of equal benefit to the economic interest of all family farmers.

II. Improvement of the farmer's ability to manage his farm effectively and economically through:

(A) Accelerated Soil Conservation Service small watershed developments with adequate funds for planning, technical services, and construction of improvements. Public policy in this area should be broad enough to include wildlife, recreation, and scenic resources.

(B) Adequate technical services to all soil conservation districts, with the long-term public interest in conservation of land and water resources supported by public funds.

(C) ACP practices which divert dropland to alternate uses on an annual or longer term basis should be given priority over land retirement. Land rental arrangements should be considered where the major benefits are of a public nature.

III. Strengthened farms and rural communities through:

(A) Earliest possible completion of the Oahe diversion project in South Dakota.

(B) Adequate loan funds for the continuing development of rural electric systems.

(C) Increased rural economic development to provide satisfactory job opportunities in rural areas, thus ending the forced out-migration of young people from South Dakota and other Great Plains States.

(D) Adequate farm credit both for continuing operations and for beginning farmers.

FACTS OF INTEREST TO SOUTH DAKOTA Components of cash receipts from farming in the State

	1963	1964
Livestock and livestock products.....	\$489,011,000	\$482,288,000
Crops.....	169,019,000	156,144,000
Government payments.....	60,122,000	67,924,000
Total.....	718,152,000	706,356,000

Source: "Farm Income Situation," February 1965, Economic Research Service, USDA.

Support prices for farm commodities

Crop	1965 support	1965 support as percent of parity	100 percent of parity as of January 1965
		Percent	
Wheat.....	\$2 per bushel ¹	82.6	\$2.52 per bushel.
	\$1.55 per bushel ²	61.8	
	\$1.25 per bushel ³	49.6	
Corn.....	\$1.25 per bushel.....	79.0	\$1.55 per bushel.
Sorghum.....	\$2 per hundredweight.....	80.0	\$2.44 per hundredweight.
Barley.....	\$0.96 per bushel.....	77.0	\$1.23 per bushel.
Oats.....	\$0.60 per bushel.....	72.0	\$0.84 per bushel.
Rye.....	\$1.02 per bushel.....	75.0	\$1.37 per bushel.
Soybeans.....	\$2.25 per bushel.....	74.3	\$3.00 per bushel.
Flaxseed.....	\$2.90 per bushel.....	76.9	\$3.80 per bushel.
Milk.....	\$3.15 per hundredweight.....	76.0	\$4.30 per hundredweight.
Butterfat (manufacturing).....	\$0.58 per pound.....	75.0	\$0.79 per pound.

¹ Support for domestic food use—45 percent of production.

² Support for export use—35 percent of production.

³ Basic support—10 percent of production.

NOTE.—"Parity" is defined as a return on family labor, management, capital investment, and risk comparable to the returns that similar production resources receive elsewhere in the national economy.

Number of farms and land in farms in South Dakota, 1950-64

Year	Number of farms	Average size of farm	Land in farms
		Acres	Acres
1950.....	67,100	669	44,900,000
1951.....	66,300	679	45,000,000
1952.....	65,500	690	45,200,000
1953.....	64,700	702	45,400,000
1954.....	64,000	711	45,500,000
1955.....	63,500	717	45,500,000
1956.....	62,500	728	45,500,000
1957.....	60,500	738	45,400,000
1958.....	60,400	752	45,400,000
1959.....	59,600	762	45,400,000
1960.....	58,400	777	45,400,000
1961.....	57,300	792	45,400,000
1962.....	56,200	804	45,200,000
1963.....	55,100	818	45,100,000
1964.....	54,000	833	45,000,000

The number of farms and ranches in South Dakota has dropped steadily from a high of 84,300 in 1931. Since 1955—or in just the last 10 years—the number has declined by 16 percent.

Source: South Dakota Crop and Livestock Reporting Service.

Realized gross and net income from farming (In millions)

Year	Gross farm income ¹	Production expenses	Realized net farm income
1950.....	\$549.2	\$344.0	\$205.1
1951.....	643.6	403.6	240.0
1952.....	610.5	405.0	205.5
1953.....	569.2	385.7	183.5
1954.....	608.2	384.0	224.2
1955.....	568.6	375.7	192.9

Realized gross and net income from farming—Continued (In millions)

Year	Gross farm income ¹	Production expenses	Realized net farm income
1956.....	\$542.9	\$380.8	\$162.1
1957.....	588.1	412.3	175.9
1958.....	744.0	448.3	295.7
1959.....	661.3	429.4	231.9
1960.....	665.0	458.9	206.1
1961.....	724.2	489.5	234.7
1962.....	753.5	526.5	227.0
1963.....	753.0	548.6	204.4

¹ Includes cash receipts from marketings, Government payments, value of home consumption, and rental value of farm dwellings.

Source: South Dakota Crop and Livestock Reporting Service.

Growth of price spreads for food products (In percent)

Product	Change in farm value, 1947-49 to 1964	Change in retail price, 1947-49 to 1964
Wheat.....	Down 9.....	Up 47.....
Dairy products.....	Down 7.....	Up 19.....
Poultry and eggs.....	Down 43.....	Down 29.....
Meat products.....	Down 22.....	Up 7.....
All food products.....	Down 15.....	Up 31.....

Farmers in 1964 delivered 46 percent more food into the domestic market than they did annually in the 1947-49 base period. Americans paid about \$69 billion for the farm-produced food they consumed in 1964—\$28.2 billion or 69 percent more than

12746

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 10, 1965

their average food bill in 1947-49. Of this \$23.2 billion increase, \$24.5 billion, or 86.9 percent, went to processors and marketing

agencies, while only \$3.7 billion trickled back to farmers in payment for their 48 percent greater volume of marketings.

Source: House Committee on Agriculture study, "Food Costs—Farm Prices," released in April, 1965.

Market spread for related products

Year	Choice grade beef (cents per pound)				Pork (cents per pound)				Fresh milk (cents per ½ gallon)				Bread (cents per pound)			
	Retail price	Farm value	Spread	Farmer's share	Retail price	Farm value	Spread	Farmer's share	Retail price	Farm value	Spread	Farmer's share	Retail price	Farm value	Spread	Farmer's share
1947	61.8	48.2	20.0	68	50.9	30.5	18.5	69	36.6	21.0	15.6	57	11.9	3.7	8.2	25
1964	77.8	46.6	35.4	54	54.6	30.2	29.8	47	47.7	21.7	26.0	45	20.7	3.2	17.0	12

¹ 3 cents wheat.

² 2.5 cents wheat.

FOOD—A BARCAIN

The overall cost of food to the consumer in the United States in relation to his income has continued to decline. In 1950, food costs amounted to 22.8 percent of personal income, while consumers paid only 18.5 percent of their after-tax earnings for food in 1964. If the costs of farm programs were added to food bills, food would still take only about 19.5 percent of family income.

In contrast to the United States, consumers in the United Kingdom, according to the latest United Nations figures available, spend about 29.5 percent of their incomes for food; in Russia, 53 percent; France, 30.3 percent; Greece, 46.3; Italy, 44.7; and Ghana, 54.1 percent.

One farm worker in the United States

today feeds 33 persons, while in Europe one worker produces only enough for 10 people. In Russia, under a collectivist system, one farm worker's production feeds only four or five persons.

STATE LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COUNCIL,
PIERRE, S. DAK.

PERSONAL INCOME IN 1964

Although personal income advanced to a new high in nearly every State in 1964, according to the Office of Business Economics of the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Plains and Rocky Mountain States did not share the national increase. Personal incomes in 1964 were down in Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota (which had the greatest negative deviation from the national increase of 6 percent—South Dakota's in-

come was down 6 percent), and in most of the other States of the area increases were generally limited to 1 or 2 percent. It is significant that in every State in the Plains and Rocky Mountain regions, nonfarm income rose at approximately average rates; the failure to meet the national average was attributable directly to the decline in agriculture.

Contributing also to South Dakota's overall decline in personal income was the very substantial reduction in contract construction (-22 percent), which resulted from the completion of military sites (principally the Minuteman missile installations).

Figures on per capita income and sources of personal income for the Nation and for South Dakota and its neighbors are shown in the following tables:

Total and per capita personal income, 1963-64

	Total personal income			Per capita personal income					
	Amount (in millions)		Percent change 1963 to 1964	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	Percent of national average, 1964
	1963	1964							
United States	\$461,610	\$487,881	6	\$2,217	\$2,268	\$2,367	\$2,448	\$2,550	100
Iowa	6,399	6,533	2	2,024	2,106	2,203	2,323	2,370	93
Minnesota	8,152	8,356	3	2,073	2,149	2,208	2,334	2,373	93
Montana	1,553	1,539	-1	3,007	1,935	2,238	2,215	2,183	86
Nebraska	3,376	3,407	1	2,135	2,147	2,276	2,300	2,302	90
North Dakota	1,300	1,298	0	1,746	1,552	2,201	2,016	2,012	79
South Dakota	1,390	1,300	-6	1,854	1,842	2,077	1,963	1,833	72
Wyoming	849	849	2	2,311	2,301	2,440	2,460	2,475	97

STATEMENT BY ERNEST JOHNSON, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

My name is Ernest L. Johnson. I am secretary of agriculture for the State of South Dakota. I am a member of this rural lobby in order to express my deep concern and that of the administrative branch of government in my State, about the depressing income picture facing our farmers.

The members of this committee are well aware, I am sure, that the United States is in the midst of the longest peacetime economic expansion in our history. A good indicator of this is the fact that between 1963 and 1964 total personal income in our country increased by fully 6 percent. The gross national product is setting new records each quarter. The economy is booming.

In the face of this you might think we are alarmists when we speak of approaching farm depressions and general recessions. Well, we are alarmed. We are alarmed because farm people and—on a broader scale—rural people are being left out of this unprecedented prosperity.

Last year in South Dakota, where nearly 55 percent of total personal income is farm cash receipts and at least another 25 percent or more is derived indirectly from farming, personal income fell by 6 percent according to the Office of Business Economics of the U.S. Department of Commerce. Between 1963 and 1964 per capita personal income in the United States increased by \$102. In South

Dakota it dropped by \$131. Per capita income in our State now stands at only 72 percent of the national average. And it was less in 1964 than it was in 1960.

The reason for this lagging in the fortunes of South Dakota and rural people is not too difficult to find. It is seated in the paradox that while our farmers have become the envy of the world in terms of productivity and efficiency, they are being forced into second-class economic citizenship by rising costs and dropping net returns.

The members of this committee are as aware as anyone of the success story of American agriculture. You know that this Nation's farmers are providing more and better food at less relative cost to the consumer than anyone, anywhere has ever produced. You know that even when the costs of farm programs are considered, the average American family spends only about 19.5 percent of its income for food, while in the country with the next lowest relative food cost—Great Britain—consumers spend close to 30 percent of their incomes on this basic necessity.

This Nation can be immensely proud of its farmers. And I believe we are. But a farmer cannot feed, clothe, house and educate his family on congratulations. He cannot survive as a viable part of our economy without a decent return for the investment and effort he puts forth.

HEROIC ACTION OF AMERICANS IN VIETNAM

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD articles appearing in the New York Journal American of June 7, 1965, and the Life magazine of May 28, 1965.

These articles bring home poignantly the courageous and heroic struggles of American fighting men in Vietnam. They serve as our link with the world of daily patrols, of sudden ambush, of attacks on Vietcong battalions, of defense of Vietnamese villages. They help us share the toil, strain, and sacrifice borne by fellow Americans.

The daily toll of dead and wounded Americans expressed in numbers, and names that many of us do not know, can only partially describe the struggle and sacrifice that those in combat undergo. We only begin to appreciate the costs of defense of the free world when we learn of the individual and collective heroism of those fighting in Vietnam.

Lt. Harold Dale Meyerkord, USNR, Capt. Christopher J. O'Sullivan, and Sgt. Willie Tyrone have made the final sac-

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12747

rifice in combat in Vietnam. With incredible courage and skill they have shown once again that the American fighting man has no superior in his ability to meet the threat of aggression.

I hope that every American will take this opportunity to learn firsthand of the sacrifice and contribution of Lieutenant Meyerkord, Captain O'Sullivan, and Sergeant Tyrone and join me in paying tribute to their heroism.

We cannot repay the loss to their families but we should make it known that all Americans owe them an infinite obligation and extend their deepest sympathies at this time.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal-American, June 7, 1965]

HERO'S LAST MESSAGE: "A MATTER OF DUTY * * *

(By Donald R. Flynn)

Losing a son on a battlefield—any battlefield—is tough. When hardly anyone seems to care about the battlefield, it's worse.

But try to imagine the feelings of the O'Sullivan family of Astoria, Queens, with their son dead in the steaming jungles of Vietnam when unknown "college students" telephoned to say, "I'm glad he got killed."

These "college students" called Mrs. Eleanor O'Sullivan, the young widow of Capt. Christopher O'Sullivan, and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. William O'Sullivan, to say that Americans shouldn't be in Vietnam.

"I hope they all get killed," one of these "students" said.

Ironically, Captain O'Sullivan didn't have to be in Vietnam. He stayed longer than he had, to because of duty—duty to his conscience, to his comrades, and to the Vietnamese who asked him not to leave.

Why was Captain O'Sullivan in Vietnam? Read these letters from a soldier to his parents and his wife, and find out.

"April 15. Dear Folks: By now, I am sure Eleanor has told you of my decision to remain. * * * I wanted to try to explain. My counterpart, the (Vietnamese) battalion commander, asked me to remain. This is in itself a rare occurrence.

HARD DECISION

"I have spent a long time deciding. I prayed to God for guidance. I thought of all the sorrow and anguish I could bring to you and Dad and especially Eleanor.

"There was only one decision. I had come to Vietnam to try to help in any way I could. I was being asked to continue that help. I had no right to refuse.

"I now know intimately the dangers involved. But I have no grounds for refusing to remain. So, I am remaining with the battalion."

On May 29, Captain O'Sullivan wrote the last letter of his life, to his wife, Eleanor:

"Tonight, my heart is sadder than it has ever been before. Lt. Don Robinson (a buddy) was out on an outpost. A regimental portion of a Vietcong force hit the outpost and survivors say Don and the two non-coms with him and the battalion commander were captured.

"If he was wounded, the Vietcong have killed him. If he was captured, we will never see him again.

SEARCH AREA

"Tomorrow, three companies of the battalion * * * are going into the outpost area to look for Don and his two sergeants. I am writing this letter because * * * I feel it is necessary to search the area, or fight the Vietcong, to find Don or his body.

"I promised you that I would be overly cautious now that I am rotating so soon.

I cannot keep that promise this time. Don has a young wife and a 3-year-old daughter.

"If he was to go looking for me, you would want him to do the best job he could.

"By the time you receive this letter, it will be all over one way or the other. Tonight, I pray to God it will be for the best.

"To lose (Don) to a duty that wasn't even his, to lose him when I possibly could have fought to prevent his going, I will never be able to forget that. God have mercy on both of us."

Captain O'Sullivan, 28, of 20-20 27th Street, Astoria, could have gone home long before that day. He didn't have to look for his buddy.

But he went, and on the way to find survivors, he and his force were overrun and killed to the last man.

[From the New York Journal-American, June 7, 1965]

I'M WOUNDED AND WE'RE RUNNING OUT OF AMMUNITION

(By Guy Wright)

QUANG NGAI, June 7.—It was their first night of rest since the battle began and they spent it talking about the two dead men. They told me about the last message they received from Sgt. Willie Tyrone, of Abilene, Tex.: "and I am wounded and we're running out of ammunition."

Sergeant Tyrone and Capt. Christopher J. O'Sullivan, of Astoria, Queens, were advisers to the 39th Vietnamese Ranger Battalion, which was ambushed at a bend in the road on its way to relieve a beleaguered outpost at Bagia.

The battalion command group was pinned down and completely wiped out, but that's getting ahead of the story. When Sergeant Tyrone radioed his message, the unit had repulsed the first attack.

"And both Tyrone and Sully, before he was killed, told us they'd captured over 200 enemy weapons. That means they killed over 200 Vietcong," said Maj. Earl Sykes. "When they're attacking, you don't capture their weapons without killing them first."

"Sully must have died instantly, judging from the shrapnel in his head," Capt. Clarence W. Dillworth said.

Captain Dillworth was a marine. The others were Army. But after what they'd been through together, a man's uniform didn't make much difference.

CALL FOR COPTER

"Sully wasn't the type you expected to get killed," the marine said of his soldier friend. "Some guys, you watch them and you figure sooner or later they're gonna get it. But not O'Sullivan."

"The last time I saw him I slapped him on the can and told him to take care of himself—it's hard to believe."

Major Sykes nodded agreement and continued the story of Sergeant Tyrone's heroism.

"When we got his message, we called for a copter to take in more ammo and bring him out," the major said. "But he waved it off. The VC were too close. He said he only had a flesh wound in the arm and didn't want to risk the lives of the copter crew by having it try to land."

Those lives the sergeant was concerned about were Vietnamese lives, incidentally. His decision cost him his own. For the Vietcong attacked again a few hours later and this time they overran the command group, killing every man.

HIT BY SHELL

The sergeant's body, when it was found the next day, had part of the chest torn away by some kind of shell that had hit him.

"I heard he was already in for a decoration," someone said. "Now it will be posthumous."

We sat for a while, not saying anything. Then Major Sykes told the strange story of Captain O'Sullivan.

"The bad part about Sully," he said, "was that he wasn't even supposed to be there. He was being transferred and could have been on his way before the attack started. But a Catholic chaplain was coming Sunday and Sully said he would like to stick around for confession."

"I'm not Catholic myself," the major said, "but I saw it meant something special to him. So, I told him, 'Sure, Sully, suit yourself. Another couple of days won't make any difference.'"

As it turned out, they made all the difference. By Sunday, Captain O'Sullivan was no longer alive. And when the chaplain arrived here 2 days later, it was to conduct a memorial service for the dead captain.

[From Life magazine, May 28, 1965]

IN SEARCH OF A VIETNAM HERO

(By Loudon Wainwright)

Harold Dale Meyerkord was a man who liked to keep track of meaningful events, and among his records is a list headed "dates on which I was on boats receiving hostile fire." The entries are numbered and with each date there is also written the place of action. The list begins with August 13, 1964. The final item is No. 30, put down by Meyerkord in reasonable anticipation after he had finished with No. 29, but there is no date or place beside it. To complete the record, it should read March 16 on a canal in the Ducton district of the Vietnamese delta, and the hostile fire Meyerkord drew there that day killed him.

Except that he died in it, the action was not extraordinary. Meyerkord himself had participated in many more spectacular engagements. He was killed in a sudden flurry of fire at the end of a day's operations, and if he had time to think after the shooting started and before the rifle bullet reached his brain, he must have been furious at being taken so by surprise. For if anything can be said with certainty of Lt. Dale Meyerkord, USNR, it is that he knew precisely where to expect trouble and was usually ready for it.

The word "aggressive," in fact, is the one most often used by Meyerkord's colleagues in their efforts to describe him, and it is always offered as the highest form of compliment. In their view—though they probably would not use the term—Dale Meyerkord was a hero. The true proportions of heroes have always held a deep fascination for me, and when I first heard about Meyerkord, I wondered what a search beyond and beneath the formal accounts of his gallantry would reveal. Would it, for example, tell me why he behaved heroically? Would it show me what sort of man he was between braveries? Would I find out what he thought and what he cared about? Could I, in short, come to know him?

The official records in Saigon provided some details on Meyerkord's job and on his behavior in it. His duty was to advise the Vietnamese commander of the 23d River Assault Group working in the labyrinthine rivers and canals of the Mekong Delta. He had also to work on the planning and carrying out of operations with other military leaders both Vietnamese and American. The 19 boats of the River Assault Group, or RAG, were used to carry Vietnamese troops to battle, but they were more than transport vessels. Varying in length from 60 to 35 feet, they carried substantial firepower—mortars, 40- and 20-millimeter guns, 50- and 30-caliber machineguns—and when they lined up and brought all these weapons to bear, they became a murderous force. If Meyerkord was aggressive, his counterpart, the Vietnamese RAG skipper Nguyen Van Hoa, suited him exactly. The two men plotted con-

stantly for action, and when they weren't carrying troops on an operation, they patrolled the waterways on the lookout for pockets of Vietcong.

On days when nothing was going on with the boats, Meyerkord went to the airfield near his base at Vinh Long and flew on observation missions in small reconnaissance planes or armed helicopters. From these trips, many of which drew fire as the choppers swooped down as low as 50 feet, Meyerkord increased his knowledge of the area and kept his charts up to date. The records were strangely bare of personal information about Meyerkord. His superiors recalled that he was 27, was married, had a wife and small daughter living in St. Louis and that he had served on a destroyer before coming to Vietnam.

There was better documentation of some of his actions. On one occasion last November, his RAG landed troops, then got well ahead of them in a canal so narrow that it was impossible for the boats with the heaviest guns to come up and fire. When the other boats began to draw sniper fire, Meyerkord scouted ahead on foot, found that the canal was blocked and that the Vietcong were waiting in force. Under heavy fire he set up a command post, called for and directed artillery, summoned air strikes, and when friendly troops caught up with him he directed them, too, in routing the Vietcong. Another time, when one of the RAG boats was damaged and two Vietnamese sailors were wounded, Meyerkord left his own boat, took another to the vessel where the wounded men were, gave them first aid and then got back to his boat, all this time in the middle of a fire fight. On a third occasion his RAG guns could not be fired because friendly troops were in the way. Meyerkord ordered the boat to back down the canal. When the Vietnamese troops saw this, they thought the operation was being canceled and began a quick retreat themselves. Then suddenly Meyerkord ordered the boats ahead, past the troops, and now, with a clear field of fire, he opened up with all the guns he had. The battle was won.

Dale Meyerkord's own log and reports are entirely matter of fact, even, in some places, laconic. "I don't wear a helmet or flak vest," he wrote at one time. "My preparations consist of setting my carbine on auto and loading it with a clip and tracers. These I will use to direct fire." After he had picked up an enemy flag in the field one day, he wrote: "The flag I can use for trade goods to obtain more weapons or other desired items." After his jeep went off the road one day when a landmine exploded just ahead, he said of it: "Examination showed that several muscles and tendons were injured." He could be sharply critical when he did not like the way things were going, and he said of one American officer whose performance didn't suit him: "An adviser that is overly cautious and places needless stumbling blocks in an operation is a handicap." And he must have been laughing at himself when he wrote: "While jumping from the boat to the pier with my gear, the pier collapsed and I ended up in the Mekong. This presented an excellent opportunity to test my waterproof watch and equipment. It all worked when I got ashore and tested it."

From men in Saigon I learned a bit more about Dale Meyerkord. "I could see right away that this was a ruddy, gung-ho individual," said his boss, Capt. W. H. Hardcastle, Jr. "He seemed to have maturity and confidence in himself." I learned that Meyerkord's radio code name was Hornblower. "He used to talk about his delta experience a lot," a friend recalled. "Sometimes even too much. He told about it in such detail a person might think he was bragging. But why should a brave man be modest and charming? He was fascinated by the whole thing. When he tried to explain to you one

of his eyeball-to-eyeball moments, you could see he was exhilarated by it.

A snapshot told me only that Meyerkord was blond and lean and not tall. I flew to Vinh Long to meet more of Meyerkord's friends. It is only 45 minutes by helicopter from Saigon, but the trip takes one into an entirely different world. The ugly little war in Vietnam seems suddenly much more personal, and the chopper pilot only slows his blades to let his passengers off. The town and the bases there are secure enough, but the VC are active in the countryside immediately surrounding it, and precautions against enemy marksmanship, like bringing aircraft into the tiny field at a rate of descent so sharp that a landing seems virtually a controlled crash, are entirely called for. This had been Dale Meyerkord's town for the last 8 months of his life, he had died in a canal just a few kilometers up the road, and it was the right place to come.

"He spent a lot of time with us out here," said Capt. Clarence Boyle, pilot and section leader for the small spotter and observation planes used in the area. "Everybody here at the field had a lot of respect for him. The V.C. respected him too. They knew all about him and his iron boats. Somebody tried to change his call sign from Hornblower to something else, but he just wouldn't answer from the boat when we gave him the new call, and we had to go back to Hornblower." Meyerkord's Vietnamese counterpart, Commander Hoa, was away on navy business, and I was not able to see him. But it became clear from talking to others that the relationship between the two men was more than professional. They had spent much off-duty time together, and Hoa had invited Meyerkord to be the godfather of a child born shortly after the American died.

Navy Chief Ralph Gentile had been with Meyerkord during his tour in Vietnam, but he was not on the boat the afternoon of the lieutenant's death and he feels badly about it. "We used to talk on the boat at night when no one was around," Gentile said. "He told me how he'd worked on farms in the summers when he was a kid going through college. He talked about his mother some, and he talked about his wife and daughter. I'm 42, a lot older than him, and he was very interested in how my wife and I were bringing up our kids, about what kind of things we wanted for them, about how much money we're spending on them. I think he was trying to get some ideas of what he might do for his own child in the future. Sometimes you'd think he was out here on a good-will tour." Gentile went on as we drank beer on a porch overlooking the Mekong River. He took about a hundred school kids out for a ride on the boats one day, and he was very good with the local Vietnamese chiefs.

He scrounged a lot of medical instruments, and a doctor showed him how to make stitches. His stitches looked a little tangled but they did the job.

Gentile paused a moment. "I think he tried to protect me," he continued. "He tried to keep me away from him when there was something going on the boats. I used to kid him when he'd go off on an operation without me. 'Well, what do you want me to tell your wife?' I'd ask him. 'Hell,' he'd say, 'them bullets turn away every time they come toward me.'"

At the airfield that night the armed helicopters came back very late from a big and successful fight. I talked to the leader, Capt. Robert Mollinelli. "The day before Dale was killed," Mollinelli said, his dirty face drawn with fatigue, "we flew out there together to that canal. We both knew it well. Dale was one of the few people we could work in real close to and not scare him or his troops. Those rockets make a helluva noise. Woof when they go, crack when they break the sound barrier, boom when they hit." Mollinelli took a sip of his iced drink. "I was

10 feet above his head that day," he went on. "As a matter of fact I tried to shoot for him, but he told me to go away. I told him to get his fanny out of the open. Just a little later somebody called and told me Hornblower had been hit. He loved to fight and he loved to live. I couldn't believe it."

Army Capt. James Snooks 3d was observing the operation from Meyerkord's boat the day he was killed. Snooks, a Navy chief named Eugene Barney and Meyerkord were on the open deck of the lead vessel when it went slowly around a curve and nosed in toward the bank.

Meyerkord, apparently not expecting anything, was seated with his back up against the windshield of the boat when the firing started. "I could see the muzzle flashes and smoke," Snooks recalled. "We were receiving fire from three positions, quite close, 30 to 40 yards. I was down on the deck now and firing with the carbine, and Barney was shooting the shotgun. Meyerkord may have been shooting too. But I wasn't looking at him. I heard him say, 'I'm hit.' Barney reached up to pull him down, got hit himself and Meyerkord got hit again. Barney said, 'Lieutenant Meyerkord is dead,' and I looked then and he was right."

I also talked to Maj. Oscar Padgett, Jr., senior adviser to a Vietnamese infantry regiment. He worked with Meyerkord on many operations. "His contribution was as high as any I've seen," Padgett said. "If you send the best over here, you're going to lose the best. He was often working from an exposed position because he could report enemy strengths and weaknesses to us better that way, and he set a great example for the men. If he found out that I had an operation that his bunch wasn't in on, he'd be knocking at the door. 'Why can't I go?' he'd say. 'There are canals down there I know better than anyone else.' He was a pretty smart lad. He liked to laugh and lie and kid me about how he was furnishing the ammunition for the Army."

Padgett paused and frowned in recollection. "I didn't really like that hat, though," he said. "It was an Australian-type bush hat, one of those things that turns up on one side, and I told him if I was shooting at the boats, I'd shoot at somebody with a hat like that. But Hoa had a hat too, a floppy one he called his fighting hat. I told Dale they looked like sheepherders in them. When they brought him in on the litter, there was that hat down around his feet."

Meyerkord's replacement as adviser to the 23d RAG is a cheerful young lieutenant named David Swavelly. He knew Meyerkord and admired him, but he did not talk much about him. I did not want to ask, but I finally had to inquire if Swavelly had found it difficult to follow in the footsteps of a man so generously respected as Meyerkord. "Oh, no," he answered with absolute candor. "These people around here made things very easy for me. They do all kinds of things for me. They see the Navy coming, and automatically you're Hornblower."

The last person I talked with in Vinh Long was Hugo Aragon, an Army chief warrant officer. He did not work with Meyerkord on operations but the two men spent much free time together and were close friends. "That was a strong, outspoken personality," Aragon said. "He told you what he thought, and he didn't think he'd die here. That day I was going on a trip in the jeep and crossed a bridge over one of the canals, and I saw him and the boats. I tooted the horn at him and he waved back."

Aragon, a short, dark man, crossed the little room and fumbled through some belongings. He came back and handed me an empty pint flash. "I'm a scotch drinker," Aragon said, "and you can't get it every place around here. You have to carry it with you. Two days before he died, Dale gave me that.

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12749

It was his." I turned the flask over and saw the initials H.D.M. in the silverplate.

A flask says nothing. You can't even tell much about a man by reading his words or talking to his friends. But by this time I wished heartily that I had some recollections of my own about Dale Meyerkord.

MERGERS AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as the chief sponsor and strategist of the 1964 mass transit bill, I have maintained a close and careful interest in the many problems of commuter mass transit which are plaguing municipalities all over the country. The question of how to efficiently and comfortably transport large numbers of working people during peak rush hours is one that is particularly troublesome to my own State of New Jersey.

Part of this problem arises from the absence of an overall, coherent policy which would integrate all transportation facilities—rail and bus, as well as highway.

I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, from the April 1, 1965, issue of the Washington Post, which discusses this problem, and, in particular, relates it to the proposed merger between the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No. 105—18

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1965]

MERGERS AND TRANSPORTATION

The proposed merger between the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads has been advanced a step further toward realization with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission's trial examiners. It now appears likely that the ICC will accept the examiners' recommendation. But before sanctioning the largest merger in this country's history, the union of the Pennsylvania and the Central should be appraised within the broad context of national transportation policy. For as the examiners aptly remarked, merger is not a panacea for the ills that beset the rails. Nor is merger a reliable route to the creation of an adequate network of transport facilities.

The Penn-Central merger, by eliminating duplicative facilities and increasing operating efficiencies, will result in a financially viable entity. But what of the eastern roads that are not included? Smaller paralleling roads such as the Erie-Lackawanna would be placed in an untenable competitive position. And more seriously, the exclusion of the Boston and Maine might well deprive much of the New England region of rail service.

Mergers must perforce result in the elimination of some weak roads, but they should not be permitted to tear great gaps in the rail network. Therein lies the weakness of the ICC's case-by-case approach to mergers. What is required is an overall plan for rail consolidation, an outline of a balanced network that would serve as a guide for future mergers.

In recommending the Penn-Central merger the examiners painted a rather gloomy

picture of the railroad future. But much of their pessimism might be dispelled if the railroads were permitted to compete against trucks on an equal footing. Railroads are disadvantaged by their inability to reduce rates without performing a lengthy ritual before the ICC.

And unlike the trucks which bear a very small part of the cost of building and maintaining public highways, the railroads are burdened with enormous costs of their rights-of-way. Unless this balance is redressed by eliminating the archaic ICC rate regulations and imposing realistic user charges on trucks, the benefits that can be obtained through wise railroad mergers will be dissipated.

If there were a coherent Federal transportation policy, a verdict on the wisdom of the Penn-Central merger could be reached with relative ease. But in the absence of a policy, one can only point to its defects and dangers and hope that they will somehow be eliminated.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Friday, June 11, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Dr. Wendell Bohrer, Good Shepherd Church of the Brethren, Morgantown, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray: O most merciful Father in heaven, who governs the people of the earth, we offer to You again our thanksgiving for every divine blessing. Especially do we thank You for this Nation and for these men and women who have been selected from its people to serve as its leaders and stewards.

We therefore pray that Your divine blessing be bestowed upon them in these crucial times. Deliver them from blindness of heart, from love of ease, and from failure to do the good which You set before them.

Grant that, in the hours of this day and in every day, they may have the wisdom to know what is best to do and the courage and the dedication with which to act upon such wisdom.

May Thy blessing rest also upon the people of this Nation and upon Thy people everywhere.

May we find the courage to be the kind of true disciples those were who were disciples of Your Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, in whose name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 5, 1965:

H.R. 806. An act to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product;

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of the Jefferson Construction Co.;

H.R. 3899. An act for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons;

H.R. 6691. An act to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

On June 7, 1965:

H.R. 2139. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes.

On June 8, 1965:

H.R. 7031. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without

amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2166. An act for the relief of Staiman Bros.-Simon Wrecking Co.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1000. An act to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6755) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, in the table following line 2, immediately under the center headings insert: "Alabama-Coosa----- March 2, 1945----- \$38,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Arkansas River" strike out "\$115,000,000" in the third column and insert "290,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Brazos River" strike out "6,000,000" in the third column and insert "14,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Central and Southern Florida" strike out "11,000,000" in the third column and insert "30,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Columbia River" strike out "73,000,000" in the third column and insert "223,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, strike out: "Los Angeles-San Gabriel----- August 18, 1941----- 10,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, after the line beginning "Los Angeles-San Gabriel" insert:

"Lower Mississippi----- May 15, 1928----- 53,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2 in the line beginning "Missouri River" strike out "24,000,000" in the third column and insert "116,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Ohio River" strike out "3,000,000" in the third column and insert "89,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Ouachita River" strike out

"1,000,000" in the third column and insert "11,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Upper Mississippi River" strike out "14,000,000" in the third column and insert "27,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "West Branch Susquehanna River" strike out "6,000,000" in the third column and insert "17,000,000".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "Act" and insert "section".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "\$263,000,000" and insert "\$908,000,000".

Page 2, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 2. In addition to previous authorizations, the completion of the Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway, New York, project, approved in the River and Harbor Act of August 30, 1935, as amended, is hereby authorized at an estimated cost of \$5,000,000."

Page 2, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 3. In addition to previous authorizations, the completion of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Los Angeles River Basin, approved by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented, is hereby authorized at an estimated cost of \$31,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, let me state that this bill varies from the House-passed bill simply by making 2-year authorizations of the required extensions of river basin projects that have already been authorized as an overall program. The Senate amendments meet with the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Public Works members, because we have had difficulties in recent years with inadequate advance periods of authorization that have caused contracts to be running out of funds when they are halfway through. Therefore, we are in full support of the Senate bill on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object because I support the bill, but, as I understand, this bill does not contain any new authorizations but only continuing authorizations for existing projects and programs and thus should receive unanimous consent, is that not correct, I ask the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is correct. These are continuing projects that have heretofore been authorized.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12797

jective of it, would be to make certain that when the decision was made as to the nature of the project, the project would have to come back for proper authorization which unquestionably is the authority of the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate and is exactly the same language that was written into the Public Building Act of 1959 and was signed by the then President Eisenhower and is precisely the same language that was contained in the Water Resources Act of 1964, signed by President Johnson, although he said he had reservations about it at the time.

So I say to all on both sides of this issue, you should support on Tuesday next the effort to reinstate the powers of Congress relating to the Northwest disaster relief bill which will be pending before you at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Boggs) having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8439) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 408, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WYDLER. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WYDLER moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8439 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 68, line 16, at the end of the line a new sentence as follows:

"This paragraph shall apply to any such closure, substantial reduction, or consolidation, previously ordered, which was still incomplete as of June 1, 1965."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.]

Two hundred and fifty-two Members are present, a quorum.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND
REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM—ADDRESS
OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I include a well-considered address, that should be widely read, delivered by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY on June 1, 1965, at Michigan State University:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

It is a pleasure to accept the invitation of the Michigan State People-to-People Committee to discuss U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Coming here today from Washington—once aptly described as "a city of southern efficiency and northern charm"—it is refreshing to return to the atmosphere of excitement, of expectation and love of learning that is characteristic of a great university.

Action is to the politician what reflection is to the scholar—and as a political leader, it is a rewarding experience to confront the enthusiastic questioning of the student and the careful scrutiny of the professor.

It is a welcomed—if risky experience.

It is welcome, because nowhere are solid arguments and perceptive judgments more appreciated.

It is risky because nothing chills nonsense like exposure to the brisk air of a university.

The subject which I am about to discuss with you is appropriate for this audience because it pertains to war and peace.

No group should be more interested in war and peace than those who will be expected to bear the brunt of the fighting if war should come.

It is therefore a natural and healthy phenomenon that war and peace in southeast Asia should have become the subject of lively debate and vigorous discussion on university campuses across the country.

As the debate on U.S. policy in Vietnam has flourished during the past 6 months, the United States has continued to be challenged to match deeds with words in opposing aggression and defending the freedom of a friendly nation.

We have met that challenge.

Our firm and decisive response to naked aggression against South Vietnam has demonstrated to our friends that our power remains preeminent and our devotion to freedom firm—and to our foes that the United States is no paper tiger.

The measured application of American power proves that we are prepared to meet aggression in whatever form—that we shall

not be forced to choose between humiliation and holocaust—that the firmness of our response in no way diminishes our devotion to peace.

Our action in Vietnam is a part of the continuing struggle which the American people must be prepared to wage if we are to preserve free civilization as we know it and resist the expansion of Communist power.

It is a further indication that the breakup of the bipolar world, which has characterized the international relations of the past two decades, and the easing of tensions between East and West following the nuclear test ban, may have changed the pattern of U.S. involvement in world affairs, but it has not diminished it.

We retain the role of leader of the free world that we inherited at the end of World War II, and in that role our responsibilities remain worldwide. In that role our responsibility extends to distant Asia as well as to countries on our doorstep.

President Johnson has made it unmistakably clear that we intend to meet those responsibilities.

It was in the role of defender of the free world that we originally made a commitment to Vietnam in 1954.

It was in this role that three administrations maintained that commitment.

Although as students of history you may debate the wisdom of the original decision to take up the responsibilities which the French relinquished in 1954, this question has little relevance for the policymaker today.

President Johnson in his Baltimore speech of April 7 and his Washington speech of May 13 spelled out those alternatives and which we have chosen as the basis of our policy.

They are three:

First. In the face of armed conflict, in the face of continued aggressions, we will not withdraw, we will not abandon the people of Vietnam. We shall keep our word.

Our refusal to withdraw is based on our recognition that sudden withdrawal from Vietnam would only weaken the position of free societies in Asia—which could only regard withdrawal as a loss of interest by the United States in the area and enticement to accommodate themselves to Communist China.

In refusing to withdraw we reject the belief that by some Hegelian law of inevitability, China is destined to swallow up all of Asia. And I find it curious that proponents of the inevitability theory so often combine it with advocacy of the Titoist doctrine that Vietnam would become an independent neutral nation if we would withdraw our military forces. The arguments are absolutely incompatible.

We refuse to withdraw in the certain knowledge that withdrawal would mean the betrayal of those who have opposed the spread of communism in southeast Asia, would mean certain death or exile.

Finally, in relation to the Sino-Soviet contest, a withdrawal by us would vindicate the Chinese thesis that militancy pays—and discredit the Soviet thesis of peaceful coexistence.

Second. Recognizing that a political solution of the conflict is essential, we stand ready to engage in "unconditional discussions." We have no desire for further military escalation of the war. We stand ready to consider any solution which would bring peace and justice to all of Vietnam, North and South.

I would like to make crystal clear who is in favor of a political settlement and who is opposed, who has offered the olive branch and who has rejected it. President Johnson has affirmed not only our willingness to hold unconditional discussions to end the war, but our ardent desire to do so.

What has been the response of the Communist governments in Hanoi and Peiping?

They have rejected every peace offer from any source. They have spurned the efforts of the U.N. to mediate. They have scorned the offer of the British. They have brushed aside the efforts of the Indian Government. In short, the Communist governments in Hanoi and Peiping have rejected all efforts to restore peace and justice to the people of Vietnam.

Third. We recognize that the people of Vietnam must have a cause for which to fight, they must have hope of a better day. We have made it clear to the people of Vietnam that to improve their lives and fulfill their hopes we stand ready to support a massive cooperative development effort—not only for Vietnam but for all of southeast Asia. It is our hope, as President Johnson has said, that "the works of peace can bring men together in a common effort to abandon forever the works of war."

These three principles—honoring our military commitment, a continuing willingness to seek a political solution, and a massive economic development program—remain the bases of our policy.

The struggle in Vietnam has a special significance for the United States as the defender of the free world because it confronts us with a bold new form of aggression which could rank in military importance with the discovery of gunpowder. I refer to the "war of national liberation."

Vietnam offers a classic example of what can be accomplished by militant Communist forces intent on deliberate subversion of a country from within.

There we have seen a Communist state refuse to leave its neighbors in peace. We have seen the infiltration of Communist cadres to strengthen and direct guerrilla warfare in violation of international accords. We have seen the Communists who control and direct the war from Hanoi insist that the war in South Vietnam is internal because many of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese. We have seen them portray the struggle as a civil war, in which the "popular forces" are arrayed against "American imperialism."

It is this new sophisticated form of warfare that is becoming the major challenge to our security, to the security of all free nations. This new warfare is often more dangerous than the old—a war in which the leaders cannot be located, in which the sources of supply cannot be easily cut off, in which the enemy forces are not outsiders but indigenous troops—in which signed truces do not halt the struggle.

The supreme challenge today is to prove to our Communist foes and our freedom-loving friends that the new face of war is no less pernicious than the old, that it can be defeated by those of strong mind, stout heart and a will of steel. We know now that most Communist regimes do not desire to blow the world to pieces. They prefer to pick it up piece by piece.

How do we successfully meet the challenge posed by wars of national liberation? We need a balanced military force comprising air, sea, and land power. We need maximum flexibility in our forces—making it possible to respond rapidly to any situation. We need men experienced in guerrilla and psychological warfare, in all the paramilitary arts that are practiced in wars of national liberation. We must adapt our aircraft and ships to the conditions we find. We must relearn the tactics of ground warfare in a guerrilla setting and adapt our equipment and our weapons accordingly.

Overwhelming military power alone is not an adequate response to wars of national liberation. Since these wars feed on seething social discontent, success in countering them requires a subtle blending of economic aid, political expertise, educational efforts,

information and propaganda programs, combined with military power.

Where wars of national liberation flourish, the military struggle is but one part of a larger social and political struggle. And these struggles will continue and revolutionary ferment will increase until governments come to power capable of implementing systematic social and economic programs designed to abolish shocking social and economic inequality between the privileged few and the impoverished masses, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between favored urban enclaves and primitive rural areas.

For the masses of the people in the developing countries of Asia who have never known the benefits of modern civilization, the status quo is no longer a burden to be patiently borne, but an oppressor to be cast off.

The primary responsibility for preserving the independence and security of a country remains with the people and the government of that country. If the people and their leaders have no will to preserve their independence, no outside force can save them. If the government can provide the people with a cause for which to fight, with a program inspiring sacrifice and effort, that government can be capable of defending itself against Communist infiltration and subversion from within. Where subversion from within is supported from outside, as in the case in Vietnam, outside assistance is needed if such a government is to achieve this capability. In many areas of the world, the United States has inherited the role of protector and defender of non-Communist nations which are under Communist assault. It is a role we have not sought. It is often a painful and expensive one. But it is an essential one, both to the security of the non-Communist world and to our own.

As I have noted, in overcoming wars of national liberation no one mode of response is adequate. At this point I would like to call attention to the nonmilitary side of the struggle that is required in this complex situation. My example again is Vietnam. I refer to the little noticed side of the struggle—the struggle for a better life. It is the battle of the Vietnamese people not merely to survive, but to build, to make progress, to move forward.

In the past decade, rice production has been doubled. Corn output is expected to be four times as large next year as it was in 1962. Pig production has more than doubled since 1955.

The average Vietnamese can expect to live only 35 years. Yet there are only 200 civilian doctors. A new medical school we are helping to build will graduate that number of new doctors each year.

Meanwhile, we have helped vaccinate more than 7 million people against cholera and millions more against other diseases. More than 12,000 hamlet health stations have been built and stocked with medical supplies.

In Vietnam, as everywhere, civilization is a race between education and catastrophe. Education is the foundation of any country's future. For it is impossible to run a government, local or national, to man factories or to enrich the national life without trained and educated people. Elementary school enrollment was 300,000 in 1955—it is five times that number today. Vocational school enrollment has quadrupled. The university population is increasing steadily.

This progress has been achieved against the most appalling odds. It has been made despite the carefully planned and executed program of terror and harassment carried out by the Vietcong.

There is a curious misconception abroad that the Vietcong is a great idealistic movement, a sort of "Indo-Chinese wing of the

American Populist Party"—to use Arthur Schlesinger's phrase. In reality, they are, he continues, "a collection of very tough terrorists whose gains have come in the main not from the hopes they have inspired but from the fear they have created."

In the countryside, agricultural stations have regularly been destroyed and medical clinics raided. Malaria control team members have been killed or kidnapped. Village chiefs, schoolteachers and others who represent order and social service have been made special targets by the terrorists.

All told, it is estimated that 10,000 civilian officials have been killed or kidnapped since 1954. If one were to use comparable figures for the United States in relation to population, this would amount to 130,000 officials.

Yet the effort goes on despite these attacks and dangers. Brave and tireless Vietnamese continue to take seeds and fertilizer and farming know-how to the villagers; teachers continue to man the schools; medical teams go into the country despite the clear and always present danger. And at their side—I am proud to say—go American civilian workers. And they, too, have been killed and kidnapped. These men and women, Vietnamese and American—and increasingly of other nationalities—are the unsung, unpublicized heroes of this phase of the struggle. So long as they persevere wars of national liberation can be defeated.

As I understand it, you have decided to participate in this struggle by adopting the hamlet of Long Yen in Tay Ninh Province. This hamlet, 60 miles from Saigon, has vigorously resisted absorption into Vietcong hands. I am told you plan to raise funds to build a new two-room school, to construct an open-air market, and to pay for both a schoolteacher and a health officer. These are things the people of the hamlet themselves have decided they most need and want.

I have heard that word of Michigan State's program has struck sparks in other campuses as well. This is most encouraging, most inspiring. For the need is so great—not just the physical need, but the need for people to know that other people stand with them. In this fashion you will be helping the Vietnamese people build a future for themselves. You will be working to defeat a new and pernicious form of aggression against mankind.

In assisting independent nations—whether in southeast Asia or in our own hemisphere—there will be required on our part patience as well as courage, the will to endure as well as the will to resist.

But our willingness to meet our obligation to assist free nations should not be confused with a desire to extend American power or impose American ways.

We do not aspire to any Pax Americana. We have no desire to play the role of global gendarme. Where multilateral organizations are ready and capable of assuming the burden of defending independent nations from Communist assault, of preventing internal rebellions from leading to chaos and anarchy, we welcome their intervention. As we know from recent history, international organizations like the UN are not always capable of stepping in quickly. When they are capable we welcome their presence.

Our stakes in southeast Asia are too high for the recklessness either of withdrawal or of general conflagration. We need not choose between inglorious retreat or unlimited retaliation. The stakes can be secured through a wise multiple strategy if we but sustain our national determination to see the job through to success.

Our Vietnamese friends look forward to the day when national independence and security will be achieved, permitting the withdrawal of foreign forces. We share that hope and that expectation.

June 10, 1965

But we know that that hope cannot be achieved if the United States shirks its obligations, if it attempts to withdraw from the world, to retreat from its responsibilities as a world leader. If we refuse to share the burden of preserving the peace—who will take it on? If we refuse to share the burden of defending free societies, who can guarantee their survival? If we will not join in the defense of democracy, what are its future prospects?

I fail to see the logic of those who recommend that we withdraw from the world. If we are concerned about our national security in all its aspects, we cannot ignore Asia because Europe has been made secure. We learned by hard experience in Europe that involvement is the price of resisting aggression, that appeasement is not only morally wrong, but a threat to national security.

In a complex world, we must practice patience and perseverance—patience to defend free nations in distant Asia as well as those close to home. We must not be lured by quick and easy solutions. We must not abandon our goals because of frustration. We must continue to pursue the goal of peace and freedom—acknowledging both the prospects of success and the consequences of failure. If we act with vision and wisdom, we shall not fail.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we have been witnessing some interesting but in some respects distressing conflicts in the presentation of our national assessment of our national economy. The policy and position of the President and his administration has been that our economic output can be steadily increased with balance and stability. Indeed such expansion is an absolute necessity in the light of increased technology and the press of unemployment. The posture of the Federal Reserve Board seems to lean against this position and seems convinced that progress can only be bought by dangerous inflation. Let it be understood that we all appreciate and highly respect the distinct role that the Federal Reserve plays in our monetary and fiscal policy. That this role calls for a cautious approach is not questioned, but it should also be responsible and ought to be responsive to the avowed policy of the country's leadership so long as that leadership is not demonstrably irresponsible.

We have as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve a very highly qualified individual. A man of great ability, high intellect and long experience and, incidentally, one of the most astute politicians outside of political office, using that term in its elective sense. Mr. Martin does very little, if anything, by accident and misadventure. Characteristically, he speaks and acts upon careful and thoughtful consideration. He would, I am sure, be the first to admit, however, to being subject to error. He still puts his pants on one leg at a time like the rest of us and he can be wrong. If my memory serves me correctly, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board was wrong in his expectations about the tax cut which we passed last session.

It is not for being subject to error that the Chairman should be faulted, however. It is in exercising less than the highest level of restraint in his public statements. His is one of the most sensitive positions in the United States. To the degree that the heavy responsibility of that office is not reflected in responsibility ringing in every public utterance, he can do great disservice.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I entertain not only a high respect for Mr. Martin, I am also deeply impressed by the complexity and difficulty of the subject matter over which he exercises with his Board awesome jurisdiction. Running tandem with this respectful regard nonetheless is a commonsense understanding of the inexactitude of the economic art which all economists interested in monetary matters practice. There are no absolutes in the field and the truth is as elusive as in any intellectual pursuit. No amount of systematizing or invention of vocabulary can obscure that fact. It behooves the actors in the monetary role then not to play the "heavy."

It is for just these reasons that I am disappointed with the recent speech by Mr. Martin in which he undermined the confidence of those elements in our society most needed to be encouraged to maintain the balance effort to achieve continuing stable progress. Cautionary criticism and advice on constructive restraint should and have been welcomed, but an unrestrained lowering of the monetary boom with the tone of impending doom is not in keeping with the appropriate role of the Federal Reserve System. That we are not alone in being disturbed by the conflicting positions between the Federal Reserve Board and the administration is obvious.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of May 31 carried a very disturbing article by Frank Porter, apparently prompted by very definite signs that the Federal Reserve Board is going it alone in monetary and credit policy, regardless of administration views.

Columnist Porter could not have put the question any more bluntly than when he asked:

Are William McChesney Martin, Jr., and the Federal Reserve Board he heads in open rebellion against administration policy?

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is my own opinion that it is about time a few blunt questions were asked and some straight answers given on the vital question of money and credit. Just what is going on?

The United States is the only advanced industrial nation I know of where credit may be manipulated by small groups without any political responsibility. Former Secretary of the Treasury Dillon was fond of saying, even in testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee, what a friendly, old time was had over lunch when the Treasury and Fed officials exchanged views on these issues so vital to all Americans. But Mr. Dillon never failed to admit, albeit reluctantly, that the Federal Reserve could always tell the Treasury where to get off. In plain words, the Fed right listen politely and then make

independent decisions on money and credit even though Treasury would vigorously disagree. Now, what kind of government is this where the voters do not have even an indirect voice in these matters?

President Johnson has pledged us adequate credit at low interest rates while wisely dealing with the gold outflow by selective measures. And our price stability over recent years has been a marvel for all to behold—prosperity without inflation. So when the Fed plunges bank reserves down close to \$200 million in the red, then maybe Eliot Janeway is right when he suggests that "right under L.B.J.'s long and inquisitive nose, Chairman Martin has crossed the President up in this most sensitive area of governmental operations."

Mr. Speaker, if it is Martin who is in charge here and not the administration or other elected officials, I think it is high time the folks back home knew about it.

The complete article by Mr. Porter follows and after it is a more recent article reflecting Mr. Fowler's reaction to Mr. Martin's recent speech:

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1965]
 FEDERAL RESERVE RESTRICTIONS RAISE SOME ISSUES

(By Frank C. Porter)

Are William McChesney Martin, Jr., and the Federal Reserve Board he heads in open rebellion against administration policy?

Or is the White House in tacit agreement with the Fed's shift toward a tighter monetary policy?

Will the trend toward tighter money and credit help choke off present prosperity, as it was accused of doing in 1957 and 1960?

Or will it reduce the threat of an overheated American economy and help bring the balance of international payments into equilibrium?

These are questions being asked about Washington with increasing frequency these days. And hard answers are hard to come by. Administration spokesmen are mum on the subject.

The Federal Reserve System exercises substantial control over the Nation's stock of money and interest rates by fixing the level of reserves commercial banks must set aside against their deposits, by raising and lowering the interest rate on loans the Fed makes to its member banks and—most importantly—through its purchase and sale of Government securities in the open market.

READING THE WIND

In the words of Chairman Martin, it "leans against the wind" by easing money and credit when business conditions are depressed and tightening up when surging prosperity threatens an inflationary blowoff.

But its critics charge that its timing is frequently off—that instead of leaning against the wind the Fed sometimes leans with it and falls on its face.

In its 1964 annual report, the President's Council of Economic Advisers singled out restrictive monetary policy as a chief factor in the downturns of 1957 and 1960.

For most of the current 51-month economic expansion, the Fed has gone along with frequent White House admonishments to keep money relatively easy. As recently as in his January economic message, President Johnson warned that monetary policy should not be permitted to cancel the expansionary effects of last year's tax cut.

When Mr. Johnson put forth his 10-point program to reduce the Nation's international

payments deficit, it was widely interpreted as in lieu of tightening money and raising interest rates to halt the dollar outflow.

SWITCH IN POLICY

But since then the Fed has switched from relative ease to a moderately tight policy—a move that possibly was foreshadowed when Martin told Congress in late February that if the President's program failed to produce results "we must be prepared to take whatever measures are needed, including of course, a less expensive overall credit policy."

The President's program appears tentatively to have reversed the outflow. But free reserves—a measure of commercial banks' unused lending powers—have been allowed to drop from an average \$103 million in January to \$32 million in February, to minus \$76 million in March and to minus \$113 million in April. The figure is now averaging nearly minus \$150 million.

This has led Eliot Janeway, New York economic consultant, to suggest that "right under L.B.J.'s long and inquisitive nose, Chairman Martin has crossed the President up in this most sensitive area of governmental operations."

AGREEMENT ASSUMED

Janeway's thesis is that the administration had assumed an agreement with the Fed on a target of zero or neutral reserves, that it assured bankers there would be no money squeeze when the bankers agreed to limit overseas loans to help the payments situation, that the swing toward tighter money is already reflected in a skittish stock market and bodes ill for the economy in general.

A Capitol Hill economist complains that the Fed "hasn't allowed a damn nickel for commercial expansion" and is putting a severe strain on business ability to finance inventories and receivables.

On the other hand, a prominent Wall Street investment banker, who is no friend of tight money, sees no danger in the present policy unless it is pursued further. He feels it is a normal reflection of the abnormal pace of economic expansion in the first quarter.

And an administration economist also leery of restrictive monetary policy is inclined to discount the negative reserve position. He notes long-term interest rates have remained stable and sees no dearth of liquidity in the economy.

[From the Washington Post, June 9, 1965]
 SECRETARY FOWLER DISCOUNTS BOOM-BUST
 TALK

(By Joseph R. Sievin)

Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, predicted yesterday that the United States will enjoy noninflationary growth and prosperity "as far ahead as one can see."

He told the Senate Finance Committee that he is "not at all fearful" of another 1929 crash and stressed that the American economy is expanding in a healthy, balanced way.

The Cabinet officer's statements came as a firm rejection of a week-old warning by Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., that there are "disturbing similarities between our present prosperity and the fabulous twenties." Martin's statement touched off a sharp stock market break.

"The dissimilarities between the two situations so far outweigh the similarities that I'm not at all fearful," Fowler declared.

The Treasury head made his comments in reply to committee questions as the finance group opened hearings on a \$4.8 billion excise tax cut bill that the House passed last week.

Fowler asked the committee to reject the House measure in favor of a more modest

\$3.6 billion excise reduction that President Johnson recommended in mid-May.

"The administration's distinct preference * * * is that the bill we would like to see emerge is the bill in line with the President's program rather than the bill approved by the House," Fowler said.

In giving the committee his confident prediction of a steady growth in economic activity, Fowler said the administration has raised its sights since it made its yearly economic forecast in January and now expects that the gross national product will be higher than its original \$680 billion estimate.

The Secretary ruled out an inflationary boom along with a 1929 bust. He said it is important to be aware of potential dangers but he declared that the economic barometers "give grounds for solid confidence that our expansion will continue without undue strain on the economy or on manpower."

"The economy is catching its breath following the very large sales and production increases of the first quarter," Fowler said. "We see and expect a continued orderly growth as far ahead as one can see."

SLOGAN IN WASHINGTON NOT "POLITICS AS USUAL," BUT "POLI- TICS AT THE FLICK OF A FINGER"

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, late Tuesday the House approved an expenditure of public funds for the hiring of operators to man some of the ultramodern, fully automatic elevators in the Rayburn Office Building.

Bright and early yesterday morning, even before the bill could be messaged to the Senate, the political pap had begun to flow. The powers-that-be had started to install the operators. Apparently the political patronage machinery was greased and rolling even before the House gave approval.

Apparently the old slogan in Washington of "politics as usual" is out. It is now "politics at the flick of a finger."

INTENSIFICATION OF NATIONAL EFFORT TO BEAUTIFY AMER- ICA

(Mr. SWEENEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent past months, under President Johnson's urging, there has been an intensification in national effort to beautify America. I sense that on the State and municipal level there has begun a local participation that can only have the most favorable effect insofar as cleaning up junkyards and effectively curtailing the littering of waste throughout the land.

This Nation not only owes an obligation to the President for his efforts in this field, but Mrs. Johnson is to be equally commended for her leadership.

I am pleased to draw the attention of the House to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial of Sunday, May 23, 1965, which points out that the basis of "America the

Beautiful" today lies as much with Americans as with Government.

The editorial of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is as follows:

CHALLENGE TO THE SPOILERS

The skeletons of discarded cars, old junkyards, litter our countryside—and are driving my wife mad.

The husband who said that is President Johnson. The words are more simple observation than political oratory, yet they indicate that the President, or his wife, started something.

They have started the White House Conference on Natural Beauty in Washington this week. That in turn is intended to start Americans thinking about the beauty, the dignity and good taste of their every-day life.

An American in London will note that Englishmen do not throw paper on the streets. An American in Paris will observe that Frenchmen do not break mementoes off the Notre Dame Cathedral. An American almost anywhere in the European countryside will see few billboards, auto graveyards and other scars against nature. Yet at home he is used to these things.

Peter Blake, who wrote "God's Own Junkyard" (not in anger but in fury), found a signboard on a giant California sequoia, a junkyard in a Rocky Mountain valley in California, and other forms of avaricious squalor destroying scenery from Miami Beach to Waikiki. More statistically, the Keep America Beautiful organization estimates that if the litter along the Nation's highways were dumped along one highway from New York to San Francisco, the road would be buried a foot deep in waste paper, beer cans and whatnot.

Such is America the Beautiful today. It is a land where many central cities, including St. Louis, are trying to beautify their downtown areas while suburban sprawl spreads across fields and meadows. It is a land where some devoted souls attempt to preserve worthwhile or historic buildings and sites while others try to exploit them commercially or tear them down for parking lots and cubed architecture.

It is a land where the finest superhighways in the world are being built, to be lined in most States (including Missouri, apparently) with billboards. It is a land where more and more people clamor for water for recreation while other people and industries pollute it, along with the air above.

It is a land where a recent Congress passed farsighted legislation to preserve a vestige of American wilderness, and to create new areas for outdoor use and enjoyment, while outside these few conserved areas spoliation seems to grow with the affluent but not yet great society.

What is it about Americans that leads them to toss a tin can here and a wrapping paper there, to cut down unique trees, to dump waste in lakes and rivers, on an ascending scale of disregard for beauty and for fellow Americans? Is it a legacy from pioneer days when the land was vast and the people few, and rugged disregard for either was free?

The land is no longer vast and the people are no longer few. Littering, polluting, bulldozing, billboarding and other forms of senseless misuse and destruction of resources and beauty must be stopped. So it is that President Johnson talks of measures with force behind them to landscape highways and restrict signboards.

Yet does it not seem strange that the Federal Government has had to take the lead almost everywhere in conservation and anti-pollution measures? Why should the Federal power have to lead and push States and local communities to protect the grass at their grass roots?

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3011

comparisons with the same month in the previous year. When the report shows a percentage increase, especially as it applies to food prices, it usually gets front page position in the press, and the radio-TV people give it special emphasis.

Conversely, when there is a price decline, this usually gets small space in the back pages, and little or no mention by the commentators.

While we accept this situation, we feel, however, that the public is entitled to fuller information for its own guidance.

The recent BLS report shows that the April 1965 cost-of-living index was up 1.4 percent, and food-price index was up 1.5 percent over April 1964. The overall cost-of-living index was up mainly because of higher prices for cigarettes (due largely to higher taxes) gasoline, medical services, barber and beauty shop services, college fees, consumer services, and apparel. The food price index is up mainly because of higher prices for fresh strawberries, apples, green peppers, potatoes, and cucumbers. These prices were up because of crop losses due to unfavorable weather and growing conditions; and higher costs of harvesting due to labor shortages mainly because the Federal Government clamped down on bringing in the usual number of stoop-labor people, traditionally brought in from Mexico and elsewhere for harvesting seasonal perishable crops.

As it applies to food supplies and food prices, the American homemaker, who has some 8,000 items to choose from, can wisely do her shopping without increasing the cost of her grocery basket by avoiding those few products which might be temporarily in short supply or up in price. The vast assortment of canned and frozen fruits and vegetables, available at normal prices, provide homemakers with a wide selection of tasty, nutritious foods for their families' needs and enjoyment.

While food prices, according to Government figures, were up 1.5 percent this April over April 1964, actually in dollars and cents, this is what it amounts to: If the Government's grocery basket cost \$10.39 a week in April 1964 this same grocery basket cost \$10.55 a week in April 1965—an increase of 16 cents per week.

Over that same period, April 1964 to April 1965 the average wages of factory workers rose \$2.59 per week. So, after paying the extra 16 cents for the grocery basket, the homemaker still has \$2.43 of the weekly wage increase left over with which to buy other things.

Within the last 5 years the average wages for factory workers increased by \$15.84 per week, rising from \$89.72 in 1960 to \$105.56 in 1965. During this time the price of the identical Government's grocery basket at the grocery store increased only 49 cents.

A leading food chain recently ran a full-page advertisement featuring a list of 60 items which it advertised originally in April 1955 at a total cost to the consumer of \$25.78. In April 1965 it advertised the identical 60 items at a total cost of \$27.10—an increase of \$1.32, or 5 percent. The headline of the ad read: "A list of foods that would feed a family of four for a week."

In 1955 when this ad was run the average wage of factory workers was \$75.70 per week. Now it is \$105.56 per week—an increase of \$29.86 per week in wages while the price of food increased \$1.32. It is interesting to note that the comparison of food prices as advertised by the chain shows a 5-percent increase from 1955 to 1965, which is the same percentage of increase the BLS reports for the past 5 years.

These are all Government figures, both for food prices and wage rates. So, when you compare increased wage rates with increased costs of the grocery basket, food continues to be the real bargain, not only from the stand-

point of cost, but in terms of convenience, timesaving, nutrition, tastiness, variety, and quality.

We feel that the people are entitled to this factual information for their own guidance. Best regards.

Cordially yours,

PAUL S. WILLIS,
President.

Tomorrow's Doctor: A Team Player?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the Chicago Daily News of May 22, 1965:

TOMFROW'S DOCTOR: A TEAM PLAYER
(By Arthur J. Snider, Daily News science writer)

The practicing physician, one of the few remaining emblems of self-enterprising, rugged individualism, would be cast in a new role as a team performer, in a proposal for revamping medical education.

While the doctor would be team captain and coordinator, his authority and some of his identity would be diluted as auxiliary lay personnel takes over responsibility for parts of the Nation's health care.

This new direction for medicine, pointing to a heightened social outlook, was mapped in a 107-page report by Dr. Lowell T. Coggeshall, vice president of the University of Chicago. The report was released Saturday by the Association of American Medical Colleges.

The report has been termed the most significant since the famed Flexner study of 1910 stimulated a rebirth of medical education and routed the "diploma mills."

Dr. Coggeshall noted that "self-sufficient independence" has historically been the character of the physician but stressed that for future health needs there is "no alternative" to the team approach.

"Teamwork is mandatory in industry, communications, education, and other fields," he said. "It should not be impossible in the health sciences."

The distinguished medical statesman called for physicians' education to be increasingly weighted in management training and problem solving rather than in encyclopedic capacity.

One of the measures of a physician's competence would be his ability to use technical assistance and work cooperatively in a team.

"He must have the broad familiarity and competence to marshal the appropriate expertise and resources beyond his individual skill," the report urged.

Purpose of the Coggeshall report, initiated about a year ago by Dr. Ward Darley, then executive director of AAMC, was to determine whether modern medical education is properly geared for the developing trends in health care.

The Chicago leader was assisted by Dean William N. Hubbard, University of Michigan Medical School; Dr. Michael De Bakey, professor of surgery, Baylor University; Dean John E. Deitrick, Cornell University Medical College; Dr. Clark Kerr, president, University of California; Dr. George A. Perera, professor of medicine, Columbia University, and Dr. Robert C. Berson, 1964 president of AAMC.

They and their consultants interviewed Governors, legislators, Congressmen, university presidents, deans of medical schools,

physicians, executives of insurance and pharmaceutical companies, and other key people across the Nation.

In a letter accompanying the report, Dr. Coggeshall wrote:

"Few persons interviewed believed improvements needed are matters of minor adjustment. Most pointed to the need to take major steps to enable the Nation to produce more and better prepared physicians and other health personnel."

The report recommended replacing the concept of medical education as a single discipline, concerned with single patient, with one that would be concerned with society as well.

This would mean working with those professionals involved with the impact of environment on health, for example.

"The physician working with colleagues in nursing, pharmacy, and dentistry no longer represents the spectrum of service for promotion of health," he said. "There must be collaboration with social scientists, economists, social psychologists, engineers, community planners, and others."

While medical schools must continue to be concerned with training more and better doctors, it also should have the responsibility for making sure that other groups on the health team are properly trained, the report said.

The training of individuals to perform specialized tasks under the physician's leadership was deemed inevitable since there are not now and apparently will not be enough doctors to keep up with the demand.

"Fortunately," the report said, "an increasing number of physicians is gaining more enthusiasm for development and use of such lay helpers."

Another reason for teaming medical care is the desire of patients to have service in one place.

"The patient, in a department-store-dominated age, is often unable to perceive the logic and desirability of 'shopping around' for health care—seeing one physician here, another there, stopping by a laboratory to leave blood and urine samples, visiting another office to have an X-ray made and returning to the original physician's office to learn the outcome," the report continued.

Moreover, he often fails to find in his own physician's office the diagnostic equipment that he knows to be in use elsewhere."

Coggeshall also called on medical schools to view education as a continuum. Instead of dropping the student after his M.D. degree, it should eventually control his internship and residency training. It also should make available to practitioners continuing postgraduate study to keep up with new knowledge.

Ultimately, the university should become the center of all medical education, the report said.

Commitment in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, the news from Vietnam today, as distressing as it is to all of us, should serve, in my judgment, as a strengthening of will and determination by this country to repel Communist aggression with ever-increasing firmness.

A3012

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 10, 1965

The headline of today's Washington Post reports: "14 Americans Die in Viet Battle."

The news report with that headline goes on to detail the deaths and casualties of thousands of soldiers and civilians on both sides of the Vietnam conflict.

Criers of doom and the fainthearted ones throughout this country will point to this loss of American boys as further reason why we should withdraw from Vietnam.

To them I say, as the Washington Post editorializes today:

Painful though the decision is, the continuation of a strong posture of resistance to aggression in South Vietnam still appears to be less dangerous than either defeat or withdrawal.

I commend the analysis of this entire editorial to my colleagues and without objection request that it be included in the RECORD:

COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

The White House statement of yesterday does not change the fact that American forces in Vietnam may now be used in regular fighting alongside the Vietnamese if the American commander deems it to be necessary. In this comment on a previous announcement that had come out of the State Department the White House insists that no new order has been given to General Westmoreland. Nevertheless, the current statements gives the public a somewhat different understanding of the policy than had been given in previous official discussion of it.

As we understand the order that has been given, American troops in South Vietnam will not engage in general combat. Their primary duty is the patrolling of important military installations and the adjacent areas. But within the scope of this mission they may fight with Vietnamese troops when the latter are aggressively attacked, if the Vietnamese commander requests it and the American commander thinks that the military situation requires it. Undoubtedly this will mean some further involvement of American forces in the Vietnamese war than the public had previously contemplated.

Yet the basic problem in Vietnam has not changed. Nor has the basic policy of this Government. The administration has merely indicated in more explicit terms that it is following a somewhat flexible policy of helping the South Vietnamese resist the aggression from their northern neighbors.

Six weeks ago President Johnson described his policy as one of "firmness with moderation." That is still an accurate description. What has happened since then is an intensification of the Vietcong's efforts to strike a series of climactic blows at South Vietnam. In response the United States has continued to bomb supply lines in North Vietnam and has stepped up its patrolling operations and resistance to attacks in the vicinity of military bases. Yet the United States commitment remains limited. In purpose it will remain defensive.

In effect the administration has reaffirmed its determination not to abandon South Vietnam to Communist conquest. This is a policy that appears to have strong national backing. Congress recently voted overwhelmingly to support the continuation of aid to South Vietnam in its fight for survival, and this determination will not waiver because the struggle in that unhappy land is undergoing some measure of transformation.

The dangers involved in this course are well known in the White House, in the State Department and in virtually every American home. But the perils of each new step that is taken have to be measured against the perils of not taking it. Painful though the decision is, the continuation of a strong posture of resistance to aggression in South

Vietnam still appears to be less dangerous than either defeat or withdrawal. For such a victory for militant communism would doubtless bring an escalation of armed aggression on a broad scale, with a graver menace for both peace and freedom.

Secretary of State Rusk took occasion to reiterate the eagerness of the United States to join in peace negotiations. Some wishful thinkers are saying that Hanoi cannot be expected to negotiate so long as the United States is bombing its territory. But the entire history of the Vietnamese affair indicates that Hanoi is even less inclined to talk when the pressure is relaxed.

The United States is trying to show the North Vietnamese that they cannot dictate the terms of a settlement by the continued use of force and violence against their neighbors. However disagreeable and costly that task may be, it still seems to involve less risk to our freedom and security than any form of knuckling under to the Communist threat in Vietnam.

Eskimo Olympics and Nuchalawoyya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, two of the most unusual and colorful celebrations in North America will soon be staged in interior Alaska. These are the Nuchalawoyya and the Eskimo Olympics, both of which are derived from the customs and traditions of the original people of the 49th State.

The Nuchalawoyya, to be held June 11 through 13 at Tanana, will include authentic Indian dancing, canoe and foot races, contests, and an outdoor potlatch.

The Eskimo Olympics, to be held July 21 through 23 at Fairbanks, will include Eskimo dances and sporting events, and a native beauty pageant.

So that these two excellent events may be better known, I insert here two recent items from an Alaskan newspaper that itself is extraordinary, the Tundra Times:

[From the Tundra Times]

EDITORIALS: ESKIMO OLYMPICS

One of the really fine spectacles to see in Alaska is the annual Golden Days celebration in Fairbanks. This exciting event will take place this year starting July 21 and it will last for 3 days. The celebration is uniquely Alaskan because it has spontaneity arising from the fact that it draws its ingredients from our State's rich heritage—its romantic past of the gold rush era and the colorful customs and traditions of its native inhabitants—the Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts.

The Eskimo Olympics section of the Golden Days has more than come into its own in the past few years and has become a definite must as a spectacle to see. It is exciting, unique, and a memorable performance.

The Golden Days Committee of Fairbanks has now wholeheartedly recognized the uniquely colorful value of the Olympics and has, this year, planned to make it even more exciting. The committee, of course, will have to have assistance from the villages and towns that will be involved so this can become a reality. One significant change the Golden Days group made was that the Olympics performances will be held indoors. This arrangement should help to give dignity

to the native beauty pageant which it deserves.

A beautiful native girl will be selected to reign over the Eskimo Olympics events and she should be the fairest of them all in Alaska. Some of the candidates will be those picked during Fourth of July celebrations in villages and one of them will be the queen of the Midnight Sun Festival at Nome. It is not too early to sharpen one's eyes for beauty and the appraisers of the comely lasses should keep their wary eyes open in places like Nome, Kotzebue, Barrow, Fort Yukon, and other places. To be the elected queen of the Eskimo Olympics has become a rewarding experience for the winners, and it should be the most sought after title by our beautiful native girls. Let this be the harbinger of spring when beauty ogles turn their fancy into thoughts of girls with pleasing personalities, intelligence, contour, and a nice turn of the ankle.

As usual, Eskimo dance contests will be held and the villages represented should endeavor to add to their repertoire and come up with some really fine dances. There should also be some additional performances, besides the popular high kick, like the hand-hop that is done by putting one's legs over each elbow and balancing with one's hand on the floor and hopping forward to see how far the performer can hop without losing his balance. This is a difficult sport but it is highly amusing to see. There are other Eskimo sports that should be introduced and they would surely please the audiences.

The Eskimo Olympics promises to be even better this year and villages and towns can play a big part in making it a reality. It is none too early to plan to present a really fine performance by each of the participants. The idea of putting on best performances ever, could perhaps be done with the thought of looking ahead to the Alaska centennial celebration in 1967.

[From the Tundra Times]

NUCHALAWOYYA

NU-CHA-LA-WOY-YA,
TANANA YUKON FESTIVAL,
Tanana, Alaska, May 14, 1965.

TUNDRA TIMES, INC.
Fairbanks, Alaska.

DEAR FRIEND: With the arrival of spring it is time to announce our annual Nu-Cha-La-Woy-Ya Indian celebration. This year we are having it on June 11, 12, and 13. Some of the main events are the authentic Indian dancing, archery contests, the awe-inspiring canoe racing, cross-country foot-racing, etc. On the evening of June 11, we will have our big outdoor potlatch.

In the past we have held these good times to coincide with the chiefs conference and the boat marathon, but this year we will have to do without them. This is the fourth time we are having this particular celebration within recent years and, of course, we would like to make it known that this big event is sponsored by the generous people of Tanana. We do this so people from outlying villages can come and share our good fortune with us, and it is always a fine time to renew old friendships and make new ones. In the past, we have had excellent dance groups from the villages of Minto and Stevens Village, and you can be sure we appreciate their splendid cooperation by sharing our fun with us.

Usually folks have people stay with them during their visit here in Tanana as we do not have a hotel or a roadhouse for our visitors. So with this in mind, we hope everyone will be able to come this year.

Sincerely,

MILTON NICHOLIA,
President.

ALFRED GRANT,
Vice President and Publicity Chairman.
HARRIET R. GRANT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3013

How To Avoid a Coinage Crisis While Reducing the National Debt**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the public I have asked that the letter I have today addressed to my colleagues be reproduced in this Record:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1965.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In almost no time the bill to remove silver from dimes, quarters and half dollars will be on the floor for action. The haste in enacting this legislation is understandable because changing the people's money is a touchy business. When it has to be done action should be expeditious. The world shortage of silver makes such action necessary.

The issue here is not whether the new coinage legislation should be enacted. It should be.

Rather the issue is what provisions it should contain to manage wisely the transition period from our old silver coinage to the new nonsilver coinage.

Gresham's law that good money is driven out of circulation by bad money has not been repealed. It will go into full operation when these new coins of nominal intrinsic value start circulating side by side with present silver coins which are intrinsically valuable. People will start to hoard the coins and we are headed for one of the most drastic coin shortages this Nation has ever faced. You are seeing the beginnings of it already.

The mint cannot possibly keep up with the demand for new coins and the consequent public inconvenience will be politically explosive. The only remedy being asked by the administration is standby authority to issue regulations against melting down coins for the purpose of selling their silver content at a profit when the price of silver eventually goes up. Shortage of U.S. silver stocks will not permit sale of silver for long at the Treasury's \$1.29 per ounce price. Thereafter the price could climb as high as \$2.50 according to monetary experts.

To avoid the impending coin shortage crisis—or to ameliorate it when it comes—I will offer two amendments to the bill giving the Secretary of the Treasury discretionary authority as follows:

1. To add a small quantity of very rare metal (to be selected by him) to the new coins and to establish a monetary price on this rare metal equal to the value of the silver in existing coins. This will keep the old and new coins at parity in intrinsic value and tend to avoid the operation of Gresham's law.

2. To issue paper fractional currency in 10 cents, 25 cents, and 50 cents denominations if needed for the public convenience in carrying out daily transactions under conditions of a coin shortage.

The bill before us also neglects to provide for another important subject—the matter of seigniorage. This is the profit the Government will make on the difference between the face value of the new coins it issues and its cost of making them. This profit will be at least 80 percent of the face value of each coin and probably more.

The value of present coins in circulation is \$2,230,100,000. Thus the seigniorage—profit—on replacing them will be about \$1,780,080,000. During the estimated 3-year replacement period, increasing needs for new and additional coins will amount to around

\$1,150 million for another \$920 million profit. Total profit: \$2,700,080,000.

Thereafter the Treasury should continue to make around one-quarter billion dollars a year profit on additional new coins it issues.

In fairness to the citizen public whose money is being tinkered with I think these seigniorage profits should be applied against the national debt rather than allowed to be sublimated into a mass of Treasury statistics, the net effect of which would be to make the administration budget look \$2.7 billion better. I will offer an amendment for this purpose also.

I surely hope you may agree that these three amendments will assist us to handle a difficult situation in a better way and that you will support them when offered.

Thank you for your courtesy and consideration.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

Russian Fisheries Make Money and Serve Military**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from Undersea Technology of May 1965:

RUSSIAN FISHERIES MAKE MONEY AND SERVE MILITARY

As part of his statement to the Senate Committee on Commerce hearings on S. 944, a bill to establish a National Oceanographic Council, Dr. Wilbert M. Chapman, director, resources division, Van Camp Seafood Co. and member of numerous professional committees, had some revealing things to say about Russian progress in fisheries. Here are his key quotes. Some of his remarks on other subjects appear in the accompanying story.

As a result of the rich unused resources off our coasts, fishermen from Asia and Europe are coming to fish them in increasing variety and volume. Our impoverished and under-equipped coastal fishermen resent this competition. This erodes continuously the law of the sea and our full freedom to use the high seas for all purposes. This freedom has been a prime objective of U.S. policy since Thomas Jefferson first enunciated the adherence of the United States to the 3-mile doctrine for the breadth of the territorial sea.

Our domestic fisheries jog along on an even keel. We do little of a practical nature to assist the developing countries in solving this problem themselves.

Russia does otherwise. They long ago replaced us in the rank of No. 2 fish producer in the world. Then they were replaced in this position by bustling Peru, but the Russian high seas fish production has continued to increase steadily according to planned schedule in all of the seas of the world from the Arctic to the Antarctic, and in the Indian, Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with their communicating seas and gulfs. It is now double ours, and their production is still increasing rapidly, a little ahead of their planned schedule. Our production stands still, and actually fell back some last year.

The most rapidly increasing domestic fishery in Africa is in Ghana. This is moving with massive and practical help from Russia.

In addition Russia is landing 20,000 tons of fish per year in Ghana from its own vessels' catch off Angola and Senegal, to the great benefit of Ghana and to its own profit. Russian vessels at present are landing 2,000 tons of fresh frozen fish per month in Nigeria where the need for protein is great. It is planned that these landings will treble within 18 months to a level of 6,000 tons per month, which Nigeria so badly needs.

The same thing is going on in Congo (Brazzaville), Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea. In Senegal, Russia bought \$6 million worth of surplus peanuts last year and for this has contracted to build for the Government of Senegal a modern fishing and fish processing industry. Algeria has just been the recipient of an ocean research vessel from Russia. Russia is building a modern fishing harbor for Egypt at Alexandria on the Mediterranean and another at Ras Banas on the Red Sea.

Russia is fishing for various kinds of fish in the Gulf of Aden and landing much of its catches in Sudan and Egypt where animal protein is badly needed, again at its profit. Russia is building a modern port for Somalia at Berbera on the Gulf of Aden. Russia has offered to do the same for Zanzibar in east Africa. Russia has recently offered to land large quantities of fish regularly from its Indian Ocean fleets in India, whose people need the protein.

Similar overtures are underway with Ceylon, which is desperately short of fish. Russia is building a \$12 million fishing port in Cuba, which also needs animal protein. It has made approaches to Brazil to aid that country in this matter.

This does not begin to cover the impact of the Soviet fishing revolution. There is little wonder that Russia has some impact in these developing countries.

It must be plainly noted that whatever military, diplomatic, and political benefit Russia derives from all this abroad, the whole operation is soundly based on a competent, expanding fishing industry at home and it does not appear to me to be operating at anything except a profit from the fishing activities themselves.

The tactical defense posture of the United States suffers vis-a-vis Russia because Russia has fishing operation where it needs them for these purposes and the United States does not.

It is no accident that the fishing base in Cuba is in a good position to interdict commerce headed for the Panama Canal, if need be. The same is true of the fishing developments in the Gulf of Aden and the Red Sea in their relation to transit through Suez; and the gift of a merchant marine and navigation academy to Indonesia, which lies athwart the routes of access between the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

Russia has sought for years, at times with success but not so much now, to aid Iceland and the Faroe Islanders in fishery matters and by so doing win them allies. It is no coincidence that these islands lie adjacent to the main commercial artery between North America and Western Europe. Having numerous and large fishing vessels working normally off West Africa makes them handy to keep an eye on what is going on down the Atlantic Missile Range. Russian fishing vessels turn up wherever the United States is shooting off something interesting, and for the most part they are making a living fishing there at the same time.

The worldwide strategic posture of the United States suffers in a major way vis-a-vis Russia because Russia has concrete plans for the full use of the ocean. The United States has no such plan for using the ocean.

Russia set out in the early 1950's to build up its world fisheries. It has proceeded methodically to do so. It passed us a long while ago because we were standing still. It is still picking up momentum. Its world-

A3014

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 10, 1965

wide fishery activities now about match those of Japan, and my guess is they will soon exceed those of the Japanese. It has, from the start, closely and carefully applied science and technology to this purpose at all levels from the education of scientists, marine architects, and fishermen, to daring design and equipment of vessels, and to the development of operational research to maximize their efficiency of operations at sea. It has not spared capital or labor in this endeavor. We can laugh at their agricultural and consumer goods industries, but in space and on the ocean they are good.

The Russians have now set out to do the same thing with their merchant marine. They are overtaking us according to their plan and expect to exceed our carrying capacity on the sea during the 1970's. I see no reason to expect that they will not succeed.

**Statement of Mr. Everett Ware Smith,
President, the New England Council Before
the Special Senate Subcommittee
on Air and Water Pollution, 89th Congress,
1st Session, Hearings in Portland,
Maine, June 2, 1965**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, last week in Portland, Maine, a special Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution met to hear testimony on S. 4 and H.R. 3988, legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Mr. Everett Ware Smith, president of the New England Council testified at this hearing in support of the above mentioned legislation.

Mr. Smith's testimony, I believe, was extremely thoughtful and constructive. The following is the text of Mr. Smith's testimony:

**STATEMENT OF MR. EVERETT WARE SMITH,
PRESIDENT, THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL, BEFORE
THE SPECIAL SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
AIR AND WATER POLLUTION, 89TH CONGRESS,
1ST SESSION, HEARINGS IN PORTLAND,
MAINE, JUNE 2, 1965**

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the New England Council, I would like to take this opportunity to submit for your consideration our views on the necessity of water pollution control legislation, and specifically, S. 4 and H.R. 3988, similar bills to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The provisions of these bills have been the subject of intensive study and debate and it is not necessary for me to review them in detail. However, I do want to discuss certain aspects of these measures which I believe warrant the careful attention of this committee.

First, the proposed Water Quality Act of 1965 would grant the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare authority to establish water quality standards designed to enhance the quality of interstate waters. In establishing such standards, the Secretary is required to consider the use and value of such interstate waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes and agricultural, industrial and other legitimate uses. These standards are to be published only if, within a reasonable time after being requested by the Secretary to do so, the appropriate

State and interstate agencies have not developed satisfactory standards. Certainly, this committee recognizes the problems facing our State and interstate authorities in their quest for effective performance regarding such standards. Nor should the record of performance of such organizations as the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission go unnoted or unappreciated. Yet, today's compelling need to continue an all-out effort toward the prevention, control, and abatement of pollution suggests that this provision for compliance by State and interstate authorities is reasonable in terms of overall public interest.

Second, I wish to comment on that portion of legislation authorizing more research into methods of combating all forms of pollution. The causes of pollution are too well known to this committee for me to go into them in any great detail other than saying that it is a combined municipal and industrial problem, and that vigorous action must be taken as soon as possible if the problem is to be controlled and eliminated. Furthermore, the problem crosses State lines with such frequency that it can clearly be termed a matter for Federal consideration.

However, one matter of need become apparent. Any legislation that proposes assistance for municipalities in the treatment of their segment of the problem should make similar provision for assistance to industry. It is my understanding that legislation to this effect has been introduced by Senator Ribicoff, and that it would permit Federal aid to industry in order to help meet required standards. This aid would include Federal loans at a relatively low-interest rate and tax relief to encourage the construction of necessary treatment plants. Such an approach is essential to the overall success of any pollution prevention, control, and abatement program. There is no question of the appropriateness of this approach in view of the fact that few industries can afford to invest large sums of money in non-productive assets such as treatment plants. Clearly then, some form of aid to industry is required. I would urge that this committee concentrate on this aspect of water pollution control legislation. In many parts of New England today, it is of greater importance to secure the compliance of industry than of municipalities.

New England is beyond that point in time which permits local political interests or private economic interests to be placed above the public interest. That was yesterday. Today, we need action programs, based on strengthened powers of enforcement, coupled to adequate financial aid, and supported by an enlightened public opinion. Nothing is to be gained from further delay of this process. We believe that the legislative needs which this committee is considering are of tremendous importance to the future well-being of New England and we hope that the Congress will provide for sufficient financial support and technical assistance in both municipal and industrial areas to make for an effective water quality program. We would only counsel that this be done without creating undue economic burdens for the public and private parties concerned.

Thank you.

Writing in the Sky

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, there have been many columns and editorials

devoted to the Vietnam situation in the past weeks and months.

An excellent to-the-point editorial titled "Writing in the Sky" appeared in the New York Journal American Thursday, May 20, and appropriately, I believe, points up our position.

The editorial follows:

WRITING IN THE SKY

The United States has resumed its bombing attacks on installations in North Vietnam—and President Ho Chi Minh has no one to blame but himself.

North Vietnam is conducting a war of aggression against its South Vietnamese neighbor. Without the material support of Hanoi, the guerrilla war in the South would dry up.

North Vietnam has been offered a chance to begin unconditional peace talks in order to end the war. It has declined. It was granted a respite from the systematic bombing of its military potential—which means the potential of the Vietcong guerrillas—but maintained silence on peace overtures.

It is clear, then, that North Vietnam is determined to continue the war against South Vietnam, and is therefore paying the price. The resumption of air attacks comes, moreover, at a time when heavier ground fighting is anticipated in South Vietnam—fighting which could involve American troops in an outright combat role.

Thus every bridge destroyed, every barracks shattered, every rail line smashed in North Vietnam is one for our side. Perhaps Ho Chi Minh will realize this after a while, and call a halt to the war in southeast Asia—as only he can.

**U.S. Public Is Strongly Opposed To
Easing of Immigration Laws**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Louis Harris, pollster, of the Washington Post Co., conducted a poll to determine the views of the American people regarding the immigration law changes proposed by the Johnson administration.

The results of that poll were printed in the May 31 issue of the Washington Post.

I believe Members of the House with due regard to the type questions, will be greatly interested in the attitudes of our people across the Nation on almost a 2-to-1 basis; determined by the poll, which follow:

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1965]
**THE HARRIS SURVEY: U.S. PUBLIC IS STRONGLY
OPPOSED TO EASING OF IMMIGRATION LAWS**
(By Louis Harris)

The American public, although largely descended from people who came to a new land to escape the persecution, famine, and chaos of other lands, today by better than 2 to 1 opposes changing immigration laws to allow more people to enter this country. What is more, President Johnson's proposal that immigrants be admitted on the basis of skills rather than by country quotas meets with a tepid response.

In fact, a survey of public opinion reveals that Americans prefer people from Canada and Northern and Western Europe as immigrants and tend to oppose immigrants from

June 10, 1965

there is a shortage of silver and certainly the increasing demands of automatic vending machines and grand scale coin speculators have combined to make the situation exceedingly difficult. But we don't think Johnson has found the right answer.

We don't propose any solution, but we do think that consideration ought to be given to a couple of things.

First, we think some real effort should be made to break loose the treasure chest which is now in the hands of people who speculate in coins in current use.

Great stores of recent coins have been purchased by dealers who store them for a few years, building up false values toward a day when they can release them at a profit or at the very worst get the face value they paid for them.

We read recently of hoards of silver coins which have been deposited in some California savings institutions by coin collectors with the agreement that they would draw interest on the face value and when the collectors wanted to withdraw their money they would get the selfsame coins back. In the meantime, the Nation bleeds for dimes to feed into the candy machines.

Perhaps this kind of banking should be outlawed. Perhaps dealers ought to be made to buy a license or pay a fee for interfering with the normal commerce in coins. Collecting coins fresh from the mint has become too widespread and on such large scale that it ought to begin to pay its way—or at least pay for the problem it is causing.

Second, we think that some of our Government economists ought to take a realistic look at the silver sales policy of the U.S. Treasury Department and decide whether or not keeping the price pegged at \$1.29 an ounce isn't discouraging the mining of silver and contributing to the shortage of this metal.

The hoard of silver in the U.S. Treasury so dominates the silver industry that half of the free world's supply of the metal, which increasingly is finding industrial and mechanical uses, is purchased from the Treasury. Yet, despite the demand, the price stays the same.

It is probably that the real value of silver has risen so much above the value pegged by the Treasury that our silver coins are worth more melted down than they are as coins, and something must be done or this will become a further complication to the coin shortage.

Obviously, our coinage system is going to be changed and our new coins are going to contain less silver, but it seems—at the very least—that something ought to be figured out to avoid the cheap-looking "hamburger" sandwiches.

Extension of the Export Control Act

SPEECH
OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 7105 to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULLEN] to protect American firms and American

interests from the Arab boycott of Israel.

As we know, the Arab League, in attempts to further its economic boycott of Israel, has required American firms doing business with any of its member nations to state, among other things, that they do not do business with Israel, that they do not employ Jews, and that the majority ownership of their firms is not held by Jews.

These requirements are not only deplorable and onerous, they are completely contradictory to the policies and the principles of this country.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the committee's bill sets forth a declaration of policy against this practice. But a declaration of policy is not enough. We need language, which this amendment provides, to prevent American firms from participating in any boycott which is carried out by a foreign nation or nations to further its own political objectives and which is aimed at a country friendly to the United States.

We cannot, of course, legislate as to what a foreign power can do or cannot do in regard to its own nationals. But we certainly can and should legislate as to the standards of our own practices.

This is what this amendment seeks to do. It implements the declaration already included in the bill by giving it the teeth which can make it effective. As support for the very principles and policies of our country, this amendment should be approved overwhelmingly today.

Time for Debate on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcements concerning the commitment of ground troops to combat raises serious questions. The history of the war in Vietnam is one of gradual escalation. The time has come for full hearings and full debate concerning this most crucial international issue. Twenty-seven of my colleagues have joined with me in signing a letter to the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee asking for open and full hearings on Vietnam. The New York Times today in an editorial strongly suggests:

The time has come for the President to take the country into his confidence and to give the Congress time for a full debate before the war is escalated any further.

I urge my colleagues to read the following editorial:

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1965]

GROUND WAR IN WASHINGTON

The Johnson administration's decision authorizing a combat role for American troops in South Vietnam is only confirmed by yesterday's White House statement; yet the statement is carefully drafted to give the impression that the United States is not embarking on a radical new course.

The White House admits that General Westmoreland, since March, has had the secondary mission of providing combat support to South Vietnamese units in trouble.

But why did Secretary Rusk at the time say that "ground combat personnel is not what is needed" and that there would be "a problem about foreign ground troops undertaking the kind of pacification effort that is required in South Vietnam"?

The White House denies that the President ordered the new combat role in March "or at any other time." It is explained that General Westmoreland's authority was "implicit" in the assignment of Marines to Danang. Yet, how could "implicit" authority have been so explicitly defined all along as was finally claimed in yesterday's White House statement? It is there limited to instances when South Vietnamese forces are "faced with aggressive attack when other effective reserves are not available and when in his [Westmoreland's] judgment the military situation urgently requires it."

As recently as last Saturday the State Department did not mention this role when, at the request of newsmen, it redefined the mission of American troops in a statement reportedly approved at the highest levels of the Department. It admitted that American troops had stepped beyond an advisory role, but described their function simply as defense of American installations and patrolling nearby.

The new role of "combat support," which the State Department finally announced this week, seems to be one of serving as a strategic and tactical reserve for the South Vietnamese Army. It presumably can take American combat troops anywhere in the country. Despite an effort semantically to exclude "offensive" campaigns, it appears to include aid to South Vietnamese units that get into difficulty during offensive as well as defensive operations.

A land war on the continent of Asia, which many of the country's leading military men long have opposed, is not undertaken lightly or without premeditation and careful planning. The doubling of American troops in South Vietnam since March and the reports that the 54,000 now there are being increased to 70,000 suggest implementation of a plan approved in February and prepared much earlier.

The time has come for the President to take the country into his confidence and to give the Congress time for a full debate before the war is escalated any further.

When the Truth Pops Out It Lands Right in Phoenix

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial "When the Truth Pops Out It Lands Right in Phoenix" by Richard Wilson, which appeared in the Arizona Republic of May 12, 1965. It is worth reading and considering—with the thought that fairness and openness of mind is necessary to the understanding and evaluation of any policy or philosophy:

WHEN THE TRUTH POPS OUT IT LANDS RIGHT IN PHOENIX

(By Richard Wilson)

PHOENIX.—One has a strange feeling in this sun-swept city of more than half a mil-

A3026

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 10, 1965

lion that the truth had been revealed to him but that he listened not. This city was and still is the home of former U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater whose advocacy of more militant U.S. action against Communist expansion cost him millions of votes in the presidential election last November.

It was en route here midway in the campaign that Senator Goldwater stood in the midsection of the chartered campaign plane and discussed off the record with reporters some of the implications of his more militant policies.

At the time, there seemed to be a not of incongruity in a presidential candidate discussing in such technical detail the nature of modern military applications. Such applications had not really figured in a presidential campaign before; prior war and peace issues had been in larger generalities.

Is it essentially true that President Johnson has now adopted policies for which his opponent last fall was pilloried? Is it essentially true, as was charged by a prominent editor at a seminar of public relations executives here, that Goldwater was "lynched" by the press and by his political opposition? There is too much truth in both charges for a light dismissal.

Now, with 200-plane air raids on North Vietnam, 45,000 troops there and 15,000 in the Dominican Republic, one must certainly conclude that the general sense of what Senator Goldwater was talking about last fall is now in fact being carried out.

The supply lines to the Vietcong are being bombed with increasing intensity and to an extent which may not even have been envisioned by Senator Goldwater. Nuclear weapons are not being used to defoliate the forest and expose the Vietcong, but Goldwater did not advocate that. Areas have been defoliated, however, by conventional bombing, and it has been stated—only for background information, to be sure—that we do not recognize a limitation on the use of nuclear weapons.

Yet, it will be recalled that in television films paid for from Democratic campaign funds, the intentional impression was given that Senator Goldwater would expose small children to the hazards of nuclear radiation.

As for some of the more general aspects, President Johnson has not moved toward the withdrawal or threat of withdrawal of diplomatic recognition from the Soviet Union, as advocated by Senator Goldwater to deter Russia from new expansionary acts. But the sternest of warnings have been given publicly and privately to the Soviet Union on the repetition of offenses against the American Embassy, and the general line of policy on an accommodation with Russia has become harder.

Many passages can be found in Senator Goldwater's controversial book, "Why Not Victory?" which are now in the fabric of national policy under Johnson. One of them is: "We must stop believing that our primary objective must be to humor the public opinion of neutral or uncommitted nations rather than to defend our strategic interests, cooperate closely with our allies, and advance our positions of strength."

Another which has a current application in the Dominican Republic: "We must make it absolutely clear, in the most explicit terms, that Communist governments will not be tolerated in the Western Hemisphere." The U.S. Marines are now making this as explicit as possible under Johnson's orders.

To cite these examples of Senator Goldwater's prescience in U.S. foreign policy is not to endorse everything, nor even anything, that he said and wrote. But it is to suggest that Americans must open their minds to rational analyses of controversial policies, and not to reject such analyses as the ranting of trigger-happy wild men.

It must be evident by now also that if Senator Goldwater was not "lynched" for his

views, as the editor charged, he was not given much of a day in court either.

Nor is it a sound reason that because Goldwater advocated some phases of the policies now pursued by Johnson that Johnson is therefore wrong. We see today on the university campuses young and old minds frozen in the kind of concepts that rejected serious consideration of Goldwater's views and now reject Johnson's policies.

We read critics who link the war in Vietnam with the race problem in this country in the leading non sequitur of current academic logic. We hear unfledged opinion from uninformed minds on the nature of the Asian struggle as a civil war comparable to our own between the North and South.

These voices are at least consistent. They oppose the Johnson policies for the same reasons they opposed Goldwater's. If they run true to form, Johnson will soon be pictured as a reckless extremist unhinged by the pressures of the White House.

Philippine Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1898, the great and distinguished patriot of the Philippine Islands, Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, declared the independence of his country from Spanish rule. The historic day is honored and celebrated by the people of the Philippines as a national holiday. On this important anniversary, I would like to extend warm congratulations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic of the Philippines, Diosdado Macapagal, and to His Excellency, the Ambassador of the Philippines to the United States, Oscar Lodesma.

The Philippines is located in one of the most troubled parts of the world. Not far from its shores are the crisis areas southeast Asia: Vietnam and Laos. Its neighbors, Indonesia and Malaysia, are embroiled in a bitter feud with each other. The Philippines is one of the few stable and serene features in a landscape of conflict and confusion. What is the explanation for this phenomenon?

There are many contributing factors, but none are as important as the long history of responsible democratic government in the Philippines. The United States can afford to show some pride in this achievement, because its administration of the Philippines was from the first declared to be temporary in nature. We had as our goal the development of institutions which would permit and encourage the eventual establishment of a free and democratic government.

That momentous occasion arrived on July 4, 1946, the day the Philippine Islands became the independent Republic of the Philippines.

Ever since then, the Philippines has been a valued friend and ally of the United States. Our country has a profound interest in the welfare of the people of the Philippines because of our long and close association with them. While

minor irritants have arisen occasionally—as between all good friends—the underlying mutuality of outlook on the important matters has kept the basic fabric of our friendship intact.

I know that all Americans join me in saluting the people of the Philippine Islands on the anniversary of their independence.

U.S. Policy in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered on Saturday, June 5, 1965, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the founding of Post 10004, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Jewett City, Conn., in my district. In this address I discussed the situation in Vietnam and I emphasized the fact that our Government is pursuing the right policy there.

The text of my address follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

Commander Kowalski, officers, and members of post 10004, friends, it is a great pleasure for me to be here with you on this occasion when you celebrate the 10th anniversary of your post in Jewett City. I am very happy that Henry Pincherra, past State commander who originally installed this post 10 years ago, is here today. I am sure he is very proud, as we all are of your post and its accomplishments over the past decade. As a member of the VFW and as one who is almost a neighbor of yours, I am familiar with some of your activities and, therefore, wish to take this opportunity to commend you for all you have done.

I should like to devote my remarks to a discussion of the situation in Vietnam, where we are presently embroiled in a war. Naturally, it is very much on our minds to keep this war to a limited basis, not to let it get out of hand and become another world conflagration. Most of all, we are interested in bringing the conflict to an early termination, so that the bloodshed may cease and our men may return to their families.

This possibility, of course, is easier said than done. We are dealing with a ruthless and fanatic enemy—and let me say at the very outset that the real enemy in this case is not the Vietnamese people, but Communist China which stands in back of the North Vietnamese and is egging them on to wage their attack on South Vietnam. In other words, Communist China is merely using the North Vietnamese as a tool against the free world. As a matter of fact, North Vietnam could not wage this war, except on a very limited basis, were it not for the substantial help it has received and is receiving from Communist China.

The situation in Vietnam has during the past year assumed large proportions all over the world and has become a matter of universal concern because of the grave threat it poses to world peace. I have received letters from people who want to know why we are there, why don't we get out of Vietnam, and why don't we enter into peace negotiations with the Communists, and similar questions.

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3027

The official reason given by our Government for U.S. presence in Vietnam is that we were invited to help that Republic, created by the Geneva accord of 1954, to organize and defend itself. It is also obvious, however, that we are in Vietnam because we think it is in our best interests and for the security of our country and the whole free world to see that the Communists do not gain control over it. Our military and economic assistance to Vietnam is almost certainly the major factor which has prevented that country from falling victim to Communist guerrilla warfare directed from the north. Consequently, it is perfectly clear that our presence in Vietnam is abhorrent to Red China and its stooges in North Vietnam.

Let me emphasize the point that the conflict in Vietnam cannot be separated from, or viewed apart from, the context of the balance of power in the Far East and the larger scheme of world affairs. Communist China would very much like to have a free hand to exercise its influence and power in southeast Asia. Indeed, its leaders have already called for "a war of liberation" against Thailand. They did not, of course, bother to ascertain whether the people of Thailand want to be liberated, Communist style.

It is perfectly obvious that the fall of Vietnam to the Communists would be followed shortly thereafter by a similar conflict and the establishment of Communist dominion over Thailand.

Malayasia's position would become untenable. Burma and India, and possibly Pakistan and other countries in that part of the world, would find themselves outflanked and at the mercy of a hostile power which has already seized a number of strategic mountain passes leading to those countries. With a situation of this sort developing in the Far East, how long do you suppose it would be before Australia and New Zealand were confronted with this threat? Or Korea, Japan, and Formosa? Or the Philippines? Or even Hawaii?

The basic questions being asked by the American public are these: Is it in our best interest to assist the Republic of South Vietnam maintain its identity? Is it in our best interest to frustrate Communist Chinese designs on southeast Asia? For the past decade the judgment of our national administrations under both political parties has been and still is "Yes" to both questions. Moreover, we have by treaty solemnly committed ourselves to this course—and the United States has not made a habit of breaking its international treaties.

The fact of the matter is that the United States cannot and will not enter into negotiations at the point of a gun. It has not done so with any adversary throughout its nearly two centuries of existence, and it will certainly not do so with the Communist who openly advocates our destruction. When peace negotiations are to be undertaken, we must enter into such negotiations from a position of strength and in the interest of world peace.

We have always been and still are a peace-loving people. We do not wage aggressive wars for conquest. We stand for peace, we want peace and we want it very badly. Yes, the United States will negotiate and President Johnson has stated on several occasions that he is willing to go anywhere and anytime to discuss matters of world peace. We shall not do so at the point of a gun or when the terms are set in advance.

In this connection, I think it would be wise for us to recall the words of the late President Kennedy who said: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

I am convinced that the Chinese Communists would like to take us on eventually in an aggressive war in southeast Asia. That is why they are constantly spreading hatred of America and presenting us in the image of imperialists in the eyes of other nations

in Asia. Therefore, it should be clear to all of us that the closer we keep our line of defense to Red China, the better off we shall be in the long run.

In February, when the United States started bombing North Vietnam, the war entered into a new phase. The United States is showing that it means business, that we are taking our commitments seriously, that we have adequate power to maintain our position and the moral courage to persevere and we are not a "paper tiger," as the Chinese believe us to be. The United States is also making it as clear to the Chinese as possible that we are not going to accept their terms, and that we are not going to retreat from that part of the world and give Communist China a free hand to extend its domination. Furthermore, the United States is showing the Red Chinese that they cannot get away with aggression against their neighbors and against the free world.

I am in favor of President Johnson's policy in Vietnam because I believe it is right and it is in the interest of our country. It is most unfortunate that we have to bomb those places and that we have to send our men to fight there, but we have no other recourse. War is always dirty, but then again, guerrilla warfare of the type in operation in that country is the most hellish and the dirtiest imaginable. The Communists are using force, terror, persecution, cruelty, and deception of every kind in their efforts to gain control over Vietnam because this would open the gates for them to eventually establish their domination over all of southeast Asia.

Whether we like it or not, we are faced with a bad situation—a situation that cannot be handled with kid gloves. We have had to retaliate, we have had to bomb them, we have had to send in our men to do the job. Certainly, we are losing some of our men there, certainly, there is great danger of escalation of the war. But we are doing our best under the circumstances to keep the number of casualties down and to keep the danger of escalation at a minimum. For this reason we are concentrating primarily on bombing military targets, railroad facilities, depots, bridges, and the like. We have avoided bombing the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi. We stopped our bombing recently for nearly a week in the hope that the Communists would show some sign of willingness to sit down and negotiate with us. But it was all in vain—not the slightest indication that they want to talk peace.

Under those circumstances, it would be a very grievous mistake on our part to pull out of Vietnam. For one thing, it would immediately be interpreted by the whole world, by friend and foe alike, as a sign of weakness on our part. The nations of the free world would see it as a sign of our unwillingness to defend the free world and, in turn, they would be reluctant to support us. The Communists would interpret it as a sure signal to go ahead with their plans to subjugate other nations and to take over one country after another. I believe that within a year or a year and a half we would be facing the same situation in the Philippines as we are facing today in Vietnam. If we gave in there, the next step would be Hawaii, and then the Western Hemisphere.

So you see that much depends on the outcome in Vietnam where our whole southeast Asia policy is at stake. But it is not merely southeast Asia alone, it is also our own defense that is at stake. This is not a matter to be easily dismissed or ignored. It is for this reason that I say to you today—and believe me that much thought has gone into it over these many weeks—that our Government is doing the right thing in Vietnam. It is pursuing the right policy there, because to do otherwise would be almost suicidal for us.

Now, I know that we are not a very patient people. We would like to see this situation over with as soon as possible. But this is

exactly what the Communists are trying to exploit for their purposes. In addition to fighting men, modern weapons, and wise diplomacy, we also need a considerable amount of patience to match the patience of the Chinese. By now it should be clear to all that the conflict in Vietnam is not going to be resolved overnight, or in a few months, or even in a year. Experts are talking in terms of 5, 6, or 7 more years. We cannot afford to waiver, we cannot afford to weaken, but we must see this thing through.

It is worth remembering too that our intervention in Vietnam began about a decade ago under the Eisenhower administration, although the buildup in manpower did not start until about 4 years ago. President Johnson is anxious to reach a settlement in Vietnam, but we cannot simply pull out or surrender. The President has stated on several occasions that the United States will "not grow tired" in Vietnam and it will "not be defeated." At the same time, he has made it clear that the United States has no desire to conquer North Vietnam, and that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side." In other words, the Communists must realize that fighting is no longer profitable, that North Vietnam is being shot up and gradually destroyed, and that it is becoming more and more a drain on Red China. When they realize that, then they will be ready to talk peace.

Thus, they are hanging on because they believe we are weak, we are decadent capitalists, we are exhausted, and our patience is about gone. They believe that our people are divided and are clamoring for peace and for getting out of Vietnam. I believe they are mistaken. Germany made the same mistake in both World Wars. Japan made the same mistake, and so did Communist China during the Korean conflict. They are repeating the same mistake today.

I believe with the President that the United States will not weaken, it will not grow tired. I believe it will see this thing through, no matter how long it takes. We have much more at stake here than mere honor or glory. The whole future of the American people and of the entire free world is at stake. The sooner and the better the whole world understands our position, the more hopeful this position will become and the greater will be the chances for ultimate victory.

George Washington once said:

"Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the rest is in the hands of God."

I believe that the American people are wise enough and honest enough to see the standard that has been raised and what it represents for us now and in the future, and I think they will rally to this standard. For the rest, we must trust in God.

And so, in conclusion, I want to leave with you the thought expressed so well by a modern-day American poet, Russell Davenport, who in his epic poem, "My Country," says as follows:

"Freedom is not to limit but to share,
And freedom here means freedom everywhere."

Recent Books on Major U.S. Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of our distinguished

A3028

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 10, 1965

colleagues two books which have recently been published by Oceana Publications of Dobbs Ferry, N.Y. These books, which deal with separate but vital aspects of our present foreign and domestic policies, are "Breakthrough to the Great Society" by David Cushman Coyle, and "Vietnam: A Diplomatic Tragedy," by Victor Bator.

Mr. Bator, an international lawyer and former diplomat, documents the history of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam from the policies of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in the mid-1950's. He points out that we must now live with the policies which were promulgated at that time. Mr. Bator contends that patient diplomacy should have been utilized in this area instead of the military action which was actually employed and which has continued.

In "Breakthrough to the Great Society," with forewords by the distinguished Senators from Illinois and Pennsylvania, Messrs. DOUGLAS and CLARK. David Coyle analyzes the Federal Government's basic responsibility to take action to meet the needs of the country and to recommend ways of using national economic power to meet those needs. The author delves particularly into the impact of automation on the American economy and examines the use of education as a solution to the technological unemployment caused by automation.

Mr. Coyle, author of several works on national and international affairs, has skillfully utilized the testimony before various congressional committees on the war on poverty in discussing many of the problems which confront the United States today. He treats creatively subjects of vital domestic importance such as the rehabilitation of the handicapped, conservation of natural resources, and public finance.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that many of our colleagues would find these books both timely and of interest.

The War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Defender, Thursday, May 25, 1965, concerning the war on poverty in Chicago. This editorial highlights the excellent manner in which the Chicago program on urban opportunity is being administered. It is an answer to the criticism that was levied when the program was initiated and clears up the misunderstanding that took place at the time.

The editorial is as follows:

THE WAR ON POVERTY

The storm of criticism with which the Chicago program on urban opportunity was greeted, has now subsided. Unfortunate and

unsettling as were the critical darts, they, nevertheless, served to clear the air of much apprehension and misunderstanding.

The Chicago program was hit the hardest. Yet it has been from the very beginning the best organized and the most studiously and imaginatively conceived effort toward systematic eradication of the blight of poverty and ignorance.

Criticism sometimes is a much needed therapy. Coming at the initial stage of a newborn mission, however, it could have blunted its growth and immobilized its functions.

The leadership here is competent and has the necessary intellectual buoyancy to measure up to the complex sociological facet of the problems facing it. From the administrative angle, the working units are staffed with experienced and well-trained professionals.

Responsible community leaders who are not directly involved in the crusade against poverty have begun to appreciate the magnitude of the task. The criticism by the uninitiated that the poor were not woven into the fabric of the operation proved to be an erroneous assessment.

Dr. Deton J. Brooks, executive director of the Chicago project, saw to it that the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act were scrupulously observed. He has established key units in strategic localities making it possible for the residents of slum neighborhoods to have a meaningful voice in solving their own problems.

Of course, there was much wailing among those persons who sought to transmute the antipoverty war into governmental subsidies for demagogues and crackpots. They were startled when they discovered that the power to fix policy resided in a council broadly representative of all factors in urban Chicago—social work, neighborhood antipoverty organization, industry, labor, religion, as well as the city government.

The execution of the economic opportunity program is entrusted into the hands of a very skillful and experienced administrator. Dr. Brooks has been a teacher, social worker, newspaper editor, statistician, and university lecturer. Few men, Negro or white, have his qualifications and brilliance. Under his able supervision, the Chicago urban economic opportunity has evolved into a shining model for other large metropolitan centers to follow.

Credit for this appointment belongs to our perceptive Mayor Daley who didn't seek a ward healer to head the antipoverty project and uproot the social evils incidental to poverty and want.

American Library Trustee Association President Outlines Function of Nation's Libraries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate condition of many of the libraries in our Nation is well known to all of us. The concern of Congress in this area was expressed by the extension and implementation of the Library Services Act last year.

The importance of a superior library system to the Nation cannot be questioned. It is extremely imperative that

good library facilities be available to all who desire to use them and that the facilities be in such a state that the library itself is able to make a positive contribution to the development of the community.

A constituent of mine, Charles E. Reid, of Paramus, N.J., is currently serving as president of the American Library Trustee Association, which is vitally concerned with the development of the library system of this Nation. In an address at the ALTA congressional luncheon, Mr. Reid provided an excellent statement on the responsibilities of the public libraries. As Mr. Reid pointed out, the public libraries have a considerable task confronting them in catching up with the requirements of the citizenry.

Libraries provide young people with an opportunity to broaden the scope of their education. They expand the recreational time of the youthful citizenry, assist the culturally underprivileged, and broaden the potential of the gifted.

Libraries are not only important to the youth of the Nation but to the adult community as well. In fact, through programs of research and adult education, the library can be a means of cultural development for each and every individual at all levels and can lead to the establishment of social and economic equality.

Mr. Reid noted that the ALTA is working in each of these areas and emphasized especially the library trustee's role in the implementation of library policy. I believe his remarks merit the attention of Congress.

Mr. Reid's speech as reprinted in the midwinter 1965 Public Library Trustee follows:

A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN LIBRARY TRUSTEE ASSOCIATION

We are meeting here today to honor those whom we have elected to represent us by reflecting their respective analysis and interpretation of our Nation's needs through legislative programming.

In our complex social and economic society, this is no mean job. It is my privilege as president of the American Library Trustee Association to greet you on behalf of more than 40,000 public library trustees serving as local, State, and national representatives of libraries.

We in the American Library Trustee Association are extremely cognizant of our responsibilities as elected and appointed officials for the establishment and maintenance of those lines of communication on all levels of government necessary to enable you to more effectively and efficiently serve your electorate.

As policymakers of our Nation's libraries, it is also our responsibility to see that those legislative programs which have been established on a national level by you are properly utilized back home—not as a substitution for local programming, but as a true reflection of Federal responsibility to establish, stimulate, and maintain libraries as the solid foundation for our educational and social processes and policies.

We know of the tremendous impact and value of the Library Services Act. It has served to prove to all those concerned that we, in failing to recognize the needs of libraries in the past decades, have established a tremendous backlog of work to accomplish.

As participants in the political process, I pledge, on behalf of the American Library

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3037

istrator; Capt. Edward A. Rodgers, superintendent of the Maine Maritime Academy; Cadet Capt. Peter K. Wursch, of the Maine Maritime Academy; Gov. John H. Reed, of Maine; Capt. John S. Everett, U.S. maritime service; and the Connecticut delegation in the U.S. Congress, as permanent evidence of the high esteem in which the maritime service is held.

DAVID GILL PROCTOR,
Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN L. GERARDO,
Clerk of the House.
ELLA T. GRASSO,
Secretary of State.

More on Jet Noise: Part V—FAA Aircraft Noise Symposium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 9, 1965, the Federal Aviation Agency sponsored a National Aircraft Noise Symposium at the International Hotel, John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York. The purpose of the symposium was to focus the attention of the aviation community on aircraft noise and its associated problems and also to highlight recent accomplishments as well as current research in this field.

The distinguished participants were: Mr. Najeeb Halaby, administrator, FAA; Mr. Harold Gray, president, Pan American World Airways; Mr. D. D. Thomas, associate administrator for programs, FAA; Mr. E. C. Wells, vice president, product development, the Boeing Co.; Mr. William T. Burns, president, Airport Operators Council; Mr. Mel Nolan, analytical chemist, division of air pollution, USPHS; Mr. Beverly Shenstone, chief engineer, British Overseas Airways Corp.; Mr. Gordon Bain, deputy administrator for supersonic transport development, FAA; Mr. John Tyler, Pratt and Whitney; Mr. James Woodall, program manager acoustics, FAA; Mr. Charles Harper, director, aeronautics division, NASA Headquarters; Mr. Harvey H. Hubbard, head, acoustics branch, NASA, Langley Research Center, and Capt. Robert Buck, Trans World Airlines.

This is the fifth in a series of statements on the problem which I have made in an effort to stress that aircraft noise abatement is a national problem. On May 6, 1965, I introduced H.R. 7981, a bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act of 1958 to provide for a program of research and development by NASA to reduce aircraft noise, and H.R. 7982, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the implementation of operational techniques to reduce the effect of jet noise. During the past month, both NASA and FAA have sponsored symposiums for the purpose of discussing the aircraft noise problem, recognizing it as a national problem. I am in agreement with this position and will continue to urge congressional action in recognition

of the problem of aircraft noise and its effect upon our citizens and our communities as a matter of national concern and one which cannot be helped, let alone solved by independent local community action.

I commend to my colleagues the remarks of Mr. Harold Gray, president of Pan American World Airways, delivered at the FAA symposium. Mr. Gray's address follows:

REMARKS OF HAROLD E. GRAY, PRESIDENT OF PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, DELIVERED AT THE FAA NOISE SYMPOSIUM, JUNE 9, 1965

Sharing the speakers rostrum with Mr. Halaby and with such a large distinguished group of coparticipants has marked advantages while listening, but it is full of hazards to the speaker. In preparing my notes, I reviewed the proposed program for areas of possible uncovered interest only to find that each facet of the sound problem was assigned to a technical expert. As, in fact, each of this program's speakers is an acknowledged authority in a manufacturing, regulatory, or operational field that in total cover almost every facet of airline operation, some may wonder what is left for the airlines to contribute.

Perhaps the biggest role of the airlines is to recognize the problem, stimulate effective action by all concerned, and eventually pay most of the bills associated with such action.

As I look back to the inauguration of jet service in 1958 I recall that noise was not a new problem associated only with jets. We were worried then about Constellations and DC-7's taking off with a full load generating up to 120 PNDB's, 250 or 300 feet over some of our nearest neighbors. I recall having a conviction that we must be able to operate jets in a manner that would improve safety around airports and at the same time make less noise. And I remember the vast amount of work that our staff, the Boeing people, and the Port of New York Authority put in on the problem. I finally became convinced that jets could be operated in a manner that would assure airport neighbors lower sound levels and a vastly decreased probability of accidents. A limit of 112 PNDB's was adopted as an outside figure for noise on takeoff. Very few people realize that this criterion was substantially below the noise levels then being produced by prop airplanes taking off fully loaded for Europe.

Even before the arrival of the first jets the airlines' concern, along with the manufacturers', had resulted in design elements that would add many thousands of dollars to airline costs.

Fifty million dollars was spent to develop sound suppressors. In the period 1960-64 an additional \$15 million was invested in the further reduction of noise in jet engines. By early 1962, the airlines had invested \$73 million in engine sound suppressors, at that rate the sum is probably doubled by now. An approximate 4 percent reduction in operating efficiency has been accepted with the use of these sound suppressors. It has been estimated that this amounts to an approximate \$10,000 cost per aircraft per month, or as one analyst has put it, a \$36 million annual penalty to the airlines in lost revenue. Other millions have been spent on high lift devices, runway extensions, special operating procedures, and operating restrictions. More money is going into these areas every day. Our industry has indeed invested tremendous amounts of cash and effort in a sincere continuing attempt to reduce the effect of jet sound on the ground community. The statistics involved are impressive to us who are making the investment, but I do not believe they mean much to the man who has just spent \$15,000 or \$20,000 for a new home, a mile off the end of a service runway.

We all recognize that there is a problem—an expensive problem, a technical problem, a human problem. A man's right to a home not shattered by outside influence of noise and vibration is appreciated; however, at some point the homeowner must compromise to some extent with the inevitable march of progress.

The pastoral life may be the better one, but it grows increasingly difficult in this modern world to insulate oneself in such surroundings. We are cohabitants of a world of machines, many of them noisy or unsightly. Among the things we live with are the motor vehicle, the railroad train, and the aircraft. The motor vehicle often seems to overwhelm us, the railroad rests in its static maturity, and the aircraft, relatively, is in its very beginnings. Roads—rail and macadam—cobweb our civilized landscape, sometimes desecrating our view by themselves, or by the often less than agreeable artifacts that roll upon them. These, in the end, we accept seemingly as more need than nuisance.

With the new one, the aircraft, we have the only vehicle whose grace of line is unquestioned and the only vehicle that takes its noise and goes away. Only its terminals are to be seen, there are no roads, no rails, no service stations, no horns, no fumes, no clutter beyond the occasional contrail. We have compromised with the great visible structure that supports the wheeled vehicle; our society cannot do less with the almost invisible structure that supports the winged vehicle. The aviation transport industry would, of course, be more than pleased to have a silent vertical rising aircraft, and within the realm of feasibility will work toward such a goal; however, in our foreseeable future, if the community wants air transport it must accept the fact of noise-producing engines.

Do not misunderstand me, I am not saying that aircraft-produced surface noise is a blessing that each airport area householder must patiently accept. I am saying that a certain amount of noise in the present state of the art is inevitable, that we have and will continue to develop procedures, equipment, and facilities to reduce it, but that noise will remain. In a metropolitan airport community, this means that people, lots of people on the ground, will be affected in some way.

There appear to be only three areas of endeavor that can generate improvement in aircraft sound levels—aircraft equipment operational procedures, and ground zoning.

Aircraft equipment, as I mentioned earlier, has been the recipient of a tremendous sound-control investment in the way of sound suppressors, high lift devices, and structural design. The industry has continuously devoted its best skills to the development of increasingly better sound-control measures. Further advancement will be made through painstakingly slow, long-term research. However, I do know that every new aircraft design on the drawing boards or in construction is predicated on lower sound levels including the supersonic.

Operational procedures have very definite limitations. To the best of our present knowledge, there are no further major steps that can be feasibly taken. Pan Am was, by necessity, a leader in developing jet noise abatement takeoff procedures. All airlines now use approximately the same procedures; some use our mobile ground control count-down facility at New York and at London. As an example of the effectiveness of this procedure and of the effectiveness of constant emphasis to our pilots of the importance of sound control, the number of Pan Am flights departing Kennedy International Airport that inadvertently exceeded 112 PNDB dropped from 11.6 percent in 1962, to 2 percent in 1963, to 1.5 percent in 1964. We sincerely believe that close control and monitoring does have a significant effect in

A3038

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 10, 1965

restricting violations to a minimum. We also believe that further significant advances cannot be made in this area with existing aircraft, the techniques having made full use of the available performance under the existing first premise of safe operation.

Beyond the considerations of equipment and procedures remains the third leg of the tripod, ground zoning. It would appear that this is the one item that has not been given sufficient emphasis; I say that it would appear that this has not had sufficient emphasis in noting that in areas directly off the ends of runways at some major airports, frame residences are continuously being erected, this despite the fact that there can be little doubt as to the eventual reaction of the new owners to aircraft noise. Mr. Oscar Bakke has been instrumental in the presentation of a program of compatible land use planning which should receive support. Further to this point of zoning, including land acquisition by the Government, Congressman TENZER, of the Fifth Congressional District of New York, made pertinent proposals in favor of Government assistance. These appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 6, 1965, under the heading, "Aircraft Noise Abatement."

An airport is truly more than an aircraft bearing surface; inclusive within its perimeters should be reasonable arrival and departure overfly zones or sound clearways. If the local, State, or Federal Government can obtain rights-of-way for highway construction, areas for urban redevelopment or park construction, certainly the same principle can be applied to the establishment of sound clearways. A minimum distance of 2 miles from runway lip, or that distance necessary to provide at least 1,000 feet vertical ground clearance, is suggested.

These sound clearways may, as suggested by NANAC, be used for parks, industrial storage, highways, or manufacturing, but not for frame houses.

The acquisition of such land areas cannot, of course, be done directly by the airlines. It must, because of various implications, be financed and handled by Government agencies.

In conclusion, let me summarize briefly the airlines' attitude with respect to noise as I see it:

1. The last thing any airline wants to do is to alienate anyone by reason of the noise it makes.

2. The airlines believe that no amount of noise is justified or tolerable unless it is determined as being absolutely essential to the public interest.

3. The airlines believe that in a community such as the Greater New York area, where more than one-quarter of all wages derive from port activities, air transport is absolutely essential—and a certain amount of noise is, therefore, unavoidable and in the public interest.

4. The airlines have accepted noise abatement as one of their primary responsibilities, as evidenced by their major efforts in aircraft procurement, operating procedures, and vast expenditures of money.

And finally, I think I can speak for the whole industry when I say that the airlines will continue to regard noise abatement as one of their primary responsibilities.

Johnson View of Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert at this point an article which appeared in the New York Times on Monday, June 7, by Tom Wicker, entitled "Johnson View of Negro."

I believe it warrants reproduction in the RECORD. The article follows:

JOHNSON VIEW OF NEGRO: PRESIDENT TAKES SAME ADVANCED POSITION ASSUMED BY SUPREME COURT IN SCHOOL CASE

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, June 6.—President Johnson has now taken the same advanced view of the Negro's role in American life that the Supreme Court took of his role in the American school system in the famous Brown decision of 1954.

Prior to that case, the Court had held and it was accepted American doctrine, that "separate but equal" schools satisfied all the Nation's legal and moral obligations to Negro education. So long as the facilities and curricula of segregated Negro schools were "equal" to those provided for whites, it had been asserted, it was all right for them to be "separate."

But in the Brown case the Supreme Court swept that doctrine aside with one sociological stroke. It held that segregated schools, no matter how "equal" technically, were inherently unequal because of the fact that they were also "separate." Segregation itself, the Court said in effect, enforced and perpetuated the role of inferiority that had been assigned to—and largely accepted by—the Negro.

At Howard University Friday night, Mr. Johnson laid down much the same principle on a far broader scale.

Providing for the Negro an equal "right" to vote, to get a job, to go to unsegregated schools, to due process of law, Mr. Johnson was really saying, provided him with no more than "separate but equal" citizenship. And just as had been true in education, so it was true in the broader view that "separate" is inherently "unequal."

Up to now, Mr. Johnson argued, the Negro population really had made up "another nation" within the United States—poverty stricken, ill educated, crowded into ghettos without gates, despised first for the color of their skin and only a little less for their ignorance and poverty. Therefore, it really was but little more than an empty gesture to make legal decrees of equal rights and equal opportunity for them.

For these things could not, in fact, exist for the Negro until he had the ability and the standing to take advantage of them. And after a century and more of oppression and persecution, after generations of the inherent inequality of separation, he had no such ability or standing.

Thus did President Johnson face squarely what must be ranked as the most difficult problem in American life. That problem is not the enforcing of legal equity for the Negro. It is, rather, the acceptance of the Negro as an equal human being rather than a separate but equal human being—a man with a darker skin rather than a black man.

That difficulty is symbolized in countless ways—perhaps first of all in the fact that since the beginning of time white has been the symbolic color of purity and hope, and black the color of evil and fear. Carried into racial attitudes, Mr. Johnson said Friday night, color sensitivity is "a feeling whose dark intensity is matched by no other prejudice in our society."

Even he chose the word "dark" to make his point.

That is why some civil rights experts are convinced that the greatest civil rights progress in coming years will be legal progress in the South. For in the Southern States, with their long history of slavery and segregation, the comparatively easy battle for legal equity is still in progress and that equity is

likely to be widely attained in the foreseeable future.

When it is, the South then will be joined with the great cities of the North and the other centers of Negro life in what the President called the next and more profound stage of the battle.

In Mr. Johnson's speech there was a hint of bafflement and frustration, as if he could not confidently suggest how that stage of the battle were to be won. More and better jobs, more and better homes, more and better schools, more and better welfare and social programs—all these he suggested as "part of the answer," and added:

"An understanding heart by all Americans is also part of the answer."

That was the nub of it, as Mr. Johnson seemed to know. The Government can provide the schools, the homes, the programs, perhaps even the jobs, although it will take time and massive effort. When the Southern States resisted school desegregation, troops could be sent to enforce it; when a southern Negro is disfranchised, court orders and Federal referees can award him the vote.

But if absolute equality for the Negro depends, finally, on the absolute end of separation for the Negroes, then troops and courts will be of limited use. For they have no jurisdiction over the human heart, where the ultimate problem lies.

General Farley Supports Strong Administration Stand in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of foreign affairs in the world of today, and particularly in view of the attacks that have been mounted against the administration's handling of the crises in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, it is important that the American people be knowledgeable and kept fully informed in this area.

A man well qualified to speak out on matters of foreign policy and the administration's conduct thereof, is former Postmaster General James A. Farley.

Jim Farley, frequently referred to as the "friend of Presidents" has known many of the world's leaders and statesmen almost as well. An excellent example was his longstanding friendship with the late Sir Winston Churchill.

Recently General Farley revealed the secrets of a private discussion he had with the late Prime Minister in 1947 which concerned the world situation at that time.

Mr. Speaker, because of the prophetic importance of that meeting and the application which General Farley makes of their conclusions to the problems of today, the full text of his views follows:

FARLEY URGES PRESIDENT TO CONTINUE USE OF FORCE IN VIETNAM AND SANTO DOMINGO—REVEALS SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL TOLD HIM HE WOULD HAVE ATTACKED STALIN WITH BOMBS UNLESS HE GOT OUT OF BERLIN AND EUROPE

President Johnson can no more abandon South Vietnam now than President Wilson could have abandoned the freedom of the

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3039

seas in 1917, or President Roosevelt could have abandoned Hawaii the day after Pearl Harbor. I would strongly suggest to that group of educators who have been holding unrealistic seances, which they have been presumptuous enough to call teach-ins that they qualify themselves by a few learn-outs themselves.

Thus, the teacher-inners have indicated that President Johnson has made hasty and dangerous decisions in the Far East policy. The slightest glance at the record and even a touch of fairmindedness will reveal that Mr. Johnson did not set the American eagle screaming. The fact is that he inherited 20 tragic years of chickens coming home to roost. President Johnson did not create the Far East crisis. The Far East crisis was thrust upon him.

By an ironic circumstance, a great deal of the Far East tragedy was precipitated by our Government taking as doctrine the preachments of the theoretical academicians of 20 years ago, among them notably Owen Lattimore and Lauchlin Currie. A Red China was no threat because it was overpopulated and underresourced and only an agrarian movement at that. The persuasive arguments this school of pundits made was buttressed by selected footnotes at the bottom of each page. But their gigantic misapprehension of the nature of the problem has had to be corrected by the millions of footprints of our forces in Korea and South Vietnam, punctuated with the headstones of nearly 50,000 American graves.

Over 10 years ago, a Republican Secretary of State hesitated when the French called for assistance in Vietnam. It is my opinion that these same "teacher-inners" who now bitterly attack the President for not consulting our allies would have denied help to our French allies when they were protecting the same territory.

Moreover, the Communist leaderships, Russian and Chinese, have never regarded a treaty as a binding instrument. They have invariably used such an agreement as a mere armistice while they massed for the next blow.

Thus, while they were talking peace in Korea they were mounting an attack on southeast Asia in general. And they succeeded so well that while they were paralyzing Laos with a laughable so-called neutralist government they were mounting their attack on South Vietnam.

Thus, if President Johnson vacates South Vietnam or compromises on it, it will not stop the war. It will simply bring it closer to our ally, Australia, and closer to home for us.

While I am at it I have no hesitation in saying that the President had no other course in Santo Domingo. Those who now deplore the use of force in that area, including some of the country's leading newspapers, were among the first to hail Castro's ascendancy in Cuba and indeed had something of a hand in bringing it about. Apparently unabashed by their stupendous blundering they continue to offer the President daily advice on how to pursue their disastrous policies.

President Johnson did not precipitate the Caribbean crisis. He inherited it and let us thank heaven he had leadership enough to use sufficient force. Failure to use enough force at the Bay of Pigs is a catastrophe, the dimensions of which cannot yet be measured. Failure to use enough force in Santo Domingo would compound that disaster. Had the President not used massive force in the first instance far more American troops would have had to go in than he is drawing out. His great leadership has saved thousands of lives and the freedom of the world.

President Johnson has been handed these diplomatic failures which are not of his making. But he has had the courage to

take the American people into his confidence and tell them the stark truth as we start the long trail back—back to a pasture which our country should never have abandoned.

In direct contradiction to the teacher-inners it occurs to me that it might serve a useful purpose if I here set forth the general views of a scholar at least as eminent as any of them—Sir Winston Churchill. Sir Winston invited me to luncheon at Chartwell in 1947. Sir Winston characteristically came to some sharp points. He told me we had learned the hard way, that we could not rely on treaties with the Communists because more than breaking them they used them as an offensive weapon against us. He said that had he had his way he would have given the Russians 30 days to start retiring from Europe. If they had not started retiring then he would have given them an additional 30 days warning. If at the end of that time they had not withdrawn he would have issued a 30-day ultimatum—90 days in all—at which time he would have attacked the Russians with the full atomic arsenal. This was before Russia had armed herself with those weapons and effected the atomic stalemate.

Have the teacher-inners ever considered the implications of the growing atomic power of Red China?

I am confident that these great war leaders, President Woodrow Wilson, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Sir Winston Churchill would endorse wholeheartedly the policies of President Johnson. President Eisenhower and President Truman have already done so.

Primarily, because experience teaches what many academicians seem to have missed: No man and no nation ever succeeded in compromising a principle. It succeeds only in compromising itself. Further in this test of strength our country cannot haul down our flag without converting it into our shroud. A military withdrawal from South Vietnam at his time would be a moral rout for the forces of freedom.

The principles at Valley Forge and at South Vietnam are the same. Then we fought for the freedom of our country; now we fight for the freedom of the world. And as President Wilson told the American people in 1917 President Johnson has told them in 1965:

"God help us, we have no other choice. And with God's help, as in the past, we cannot fail."

[From the New York (N.Y.) News, May 28, 1965]

FARLEY, AT 77, RECALLS WINNIE AND REDS
(By Neal Patterson)

Winston Churchill told James A. Farley in 1947 that, if he had had his way, the Russians would have been ordered to get out of Europe in 90 days after V-E Day under threat of being attacked with the full atomic arsenal.

Farley, Democratic elder statesman and onetime Postmaster General, made that disclosure at a prebirthday conference yesterday. Farley will be 77 Sunday.

Farley in other remarks endorsed President Johnson's use of massive force in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

"President Johnson," he said, "can no more abandon South Vietnam now than President Wilson could have abandoned the freedom of the seas in 1917 or President Roosevelt could have abandoned Hawaii the day after Pearl Harbor."

His conversation with Churchill about Russia's occupation of Eastern Europe took place, he said, during a visit he and his son, James, Junior, made to the wartime Prime Minister at the latter's Chartwell home.

"Sir Winston said that had he had his way he would have given the Russians 30 days to start retiring from Europe," Farley

said. "If they had not started retirement he would have, given them an additional 30 days' warning."

"If at the end of that time they had not withdrawn, he would have issued a 30-day ultimatum—90 days in all—at which time he would have attacked the Russians with the full atomic arsenal."

This 1947 conversation, Farley pointed out, was before Russia achieved nuclear weapons and produced an atomic stalemate. Churchill by that time was out of power.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 28, 1965]

FARLEY ASSERTS CHURCHILL PROPOSED ATTACK ON SOVIET

James A. Farley said yesterday that Sir Winston Churchill once told him the Western powers should attack the Russians "with the full atomic arsenal" if the Russians did not get out of Europe.

The former Postmaster General said at a news conference that the late British Prime Minister expressed that opinion during a conversation at Sir Winston's home in 1947. At the time Sir Winston was leader of the Conservative opposition.

Mr. Farley mentioned Churchill during a defense of President Johnson's Vietnam policy. He said he believed Sir Winston would have endorsed President Johnson's actions. "He told me we had learned the hard way," Mr. Farley said, "that we could not rely on treaties with the Communists because more than breaking them, they used them as an offensive weapon against us."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, May 28, 1965]

FARLEY AND CITY POLITICS

With machin-gun rapidity, James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former Democratic national chairman, gave a birthday interview (he will be 77 Sunday). Items: Mayor Wagner will win over Republican John V. Lindsay; the "squabbles" in the Democratic Party engineered by the mayor are "bad politics"; Farley will not offer himself as an intermediary to patch up the Wagner fights against Charles A. Buckley, crusty Bronx leader, and Assemblyman Stanley Steingut, Brooklyn boss.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, May 28, 1965]

FARLEY ON VIETNAM

(By James L. Kilgallen)

Urging President Johnson to continue using force in free Vietnam, James A. Farley said the President could no more abandon Vietnam than President Roosevelt could have abandoned Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Farley made his statement at a party given him by friends in his offices at 515 Madison Avenue yesterday in honor of the elder statesman's 77th birthday next Sunday.

He also lashed out against opponents of the use of force in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

"I would strongly suggest to that group of educators who have been holding unrealistic seances, which they have been presumptuous enough to call 'teach-ins' that they qualify themselves by a few 'learn-outs,'" Mr. Farley said.

BACKS DECISIONS

"The 'teacher-inners' have indicated that President Johnson has made hasty and dangerous decisions in the Far East policy. The slightest glance at the record, and even a touch of fair mindedness, will reveal that Mr. Johnson did not set the American Eagle screaming."

"President Johnson did not create the Far East crisis. The Far East crisis was thrust upon him."

"He can no more abandon South Vietnam now than President Wilson could have aban-

A3040

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 10, 1965

doned the freedom of the seas in 1917, or President Roosevelt could have abandoned Hawaii the day after Pearl Harbor."

Pulling our troops and aid out of Vietnam, Mr. Farley said, will not stop the war. "It will simply bring it closer to our ally, Australia, and closer to home to us."

Turning to the Dominican Republic, the gray-haired, ruddy-faced septuagenarian said he could not hesitate "in saying that the President had no other course in Santo Domingo."

"Those who now deplore the use of force there were among the first to hail Castro's ascendancy in Cuba. President Johnson did not precipitate the Caribbean crisis," Mr. Farley stressed. "He inherited it."

THIRTY-DAY DEADLINE

Then, turning back the clock 18 years to 1947 when he lunched with the late Sir Winston Churchill, Mr. Farley recalled the British statesman's ideas on how to deal with the Russians.

"If he had his way," Mr. Farley said of Sir Winston, "he would have given the Russians 30 days to start retiring from Europe. If they had not begun withdrawing, then he would have given them another 30-day warning."

"If they had not started retiring by then," Mr. Farley said, "he would have issued a 30-day ultimatum—90 days in all—at which time he would have attacked the Russians with the full atomic arsenal."

"This was before Russia had armed herself with those weapons and effected the atomic stalemate."

Mr. Farley told well wishers he felt fine, except for a slight head cold. "This is just another birthday," he said.

Mrs. R. Templeton Smith: Pittsburgh Civic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania have been greatly blessed with outstanding citizens who have contributed so much to the progress and cultural development of the region. One of our most honored citizens in the city of Pittsburgh during her lifetime was Mrs. R. Templeton Smith, the former Eliza Jane Kennedy, whose tireless efforts over the years gave so much toward improving the civic life and governmental structure of Pittsburgh. Mr. and Mrs. R. Templeton Smith have made a fine team in our business and civic life that is deserving of every respect.

As president of the Allegheny County League of Women Voters, Mrs. Smith was known as the "conscience of Pittsburgh." Her study was directed at nearly every facet of city, county, State, and Federal government in her drive for economy in public spending. She led the fight for women's right to vote in the Pittsburgh area, and she devoted her whole life to personifying the contribution of the American Woman to our public good, and integrity in government.

As an admirer of Mrs. R. Templeton Smith, it is a pleasure to commemorate her efforts with these following tributes:

[From the North Hills (Pa.) News Record, Nov. 11, 1964]

FRIEND OF GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government never had a better friend than Mrs. R. Templeton Smith, of Pittsburgh, who died recently at 74 years. For a half century and more she fought the good fight in its defense in Allegheny County and in Pittsburgh. There has been none like her and there may never be again.

Mrs. Smith was first of all a woman of courage and conviction. She had a deep sense of civic responsibility and of justice. She recognized much that is wrong in government and she did her best to correct it. Her persistent activities brought her into contact at some time or other in her career with nearly every public official in the city and county.

She did not harangue, scold, threaten or browbeat. What she had to say she expressed in calm words and in logic. She was sure of the rightness of her cause. She was the bitter foe of injustice, inefficiency, waste, and complacency in government. She hounded alike Democratic and Republican officials for what she considered to be mistakes, blunders, and plain stupidity. Some of them winced when she spoke but they admired her for her sincerity.

For 40 years, as its president, she made Allegheny County League of Women Voters a power in the community. In earlier years she was an active suffragist.

Few women—or men—succeeded in crowding so much activity into their lifetimes as did Mrs. Smith. She leaves her community a better place than she found it. Every resident of Allegheny County now and for years to come will be in her debt. There is none to take her place. We hope some fitting memorial will be raised in honor of this woman who gave so much while asking nothing in return.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Oct. 23, 1964]

MRS. R. T. SMITH: VOTERS LEAGUE HEAD SPURRED CITY REFORM

Mrs. R. Templeton Smith, long prominent on the Pittsburgh public scene, died in her sleep during the night at her home in Squirrel Hill.

The death was discovered at 7:25 a.m. She had been a patient at Presbyterian Hospital but returned recently to her home at 1336 Shady Avenue.

Mrs. Smith, born December 11, 1889, at Latrobe, was a relentless, tenacious watchdog of the city's purse strings. She probably attended more budget sessions over the years than anyone else in Pittsburgh—either in or out of government.

Her scrutiny was directed at nearly every facet of city government—from bridge painters to rubbish collectors. She also spearheaded drives for grand jury investigations into the rackets and alleged vote frauds.

But her vigilance was not partisan. She hounded the coattails of both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Only once in her long career of civic ventures—which spanned a half century—did Mrs. Smith go after an elective office above that of committeewoman.

Despite failing health she joined with retired Adm. Ben Moreell to seek posts as delegates to the GOP National Convention at San Francisco in 1964.

Though they both lost, their conservative hero, U.S. Senator Barry M. Goldwater, won the nomination to oppose President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Born Eliza Jane Kennedy, she was a daughter of Julian and Jane Brenneman Kennedy. Her father was a widely known engineer.

The family moved to Pittsburgh when Eliza Jane was only 3.

She was the only woman ever to have her hands on the city purse strings and she pruned the budget like no other housewife ever did. Mayor William McNair, whom she

supported in 1932, gave her the post of budget adviser which she held for 2 years.

Later, she complained that she couldn't even get a look at budget figures.

At a time when the city paid for garbage disposal by the pound, the vigilant Mrs. Smith claimed that collectors were watering down the refuse in order to collect a higher fee.

In the aftermath of a wave of sex slayings, she led the fight for a revamped and modern central communication center in the police bureau. It began operations in 1950.

A graduate of Thurston Prep School in 1903, Mrs. Smith went on to study economics and political science at Vassar, where she received her degree in 1912.

She attended a school operated by Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt for suffrage work. With a sister, the late Mrs. T. O. Miller, and her mother, she marched in suffrage parades and devoted most of her time to obtaining the right to vote for her sex.

At the time she was treasurer of the Equal Franchise Federation. But with the passage of the 19th amendment—women's suffrage—in August 1920, the federation was changed to the Allegheny County League of Women Voters.

She served as president of the league from 1924 until her death.

STUCK NOSES IN

A petite woman who shunned jewelry and cosmetics, she claimed of the league: "We stuck our noses into everything."

She married R. Templeton Smith, former executive vice president of the old Pittsburgh Coal Co. in 1915. Mr. Smith later headed a pharmaceutical laboratory firm here.

A stickler for economy in government, Mrs. Smith was a formidable foe of most governmental authorities. She opposed them on the grounds that they were not responsive to the electorate and in a position to circumvent legal debt limits.

Her sons, Kennedy and Templeton Smith, are both lawyers in Pittsburgh. She also leaves eight grandchildren.

Friends are being received at H. Samson's, Inc., 537 Neville Street, Oakland, from 2 to 4 p.m. and 7 to 9 p.m. and from 10 a.m. to noon Monday.

Services will be at 1:30 p.m. Monday at Shadyside Presbyterian Church.

The family suggests contributions be made to the Allegheny County League of Women Voters, 817 Bigelow Apartments.

ELIZA KENNEDY SMITH: BORN DECEMBER 11, 1889, AT LATROBE, PA.—DIED OCTOBER 23, 1964, AT PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mrs. R. Templeton Smith, formerly Eliza Jane Kennedy, was born at Latrobe, Pa., December 11, 1889, to Jane Eliza Brenneman Kennedy and Julian Kennedy, internationally known engineer. The family moved to Pittsburgh when she was 2 and she was a resident of Pittsburgh for the rest of her life. She was reared in the First United Presbyterian Church but subsequently became, and was at the time of her death, a member of the Shadyside Presbyterian Church.

Eliza Kennedy graduated from Thurston Preparatory School in 1903 and from Vassar College in 1912 with an A.B. degree. Her majors were economics and political science.

In 1915 she married R. Templeton Smith, of Pittsburgh, later to become executive vice president of Pittsburgh Coal Co. and now president of Ben Venue Laboratories, a pharmaceutical firm which pioneered in the development and manufacture of hormones and antibiotics. They have two sons, and eight grandchildren.

From college days, Mrs. Smith had concerned herself primarily with the education of women for citizenship. After attending Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt's school for suffrage workers, she became treasurer of the Equal Franchise Federation and gave most of her time to the educational campaign for

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3043

7. Condemn the Warsaw agents of Moscow for their betraying of the most essential interests of the Polish nation, for their dissipation of the hard-earned money of the Polish people in the interest of the Soviet Union and the Soviet world aggression;

8. Condemn them for their helping out Moscow in biological destruction of the Polish nation through demoralization of the Polish youth and through their depopulation policy;

9. Condemn them for their continuous sharpening of censorship and limiting freedom of the Polish science;

10. Condemn them for their disgracing the Polish people by their subversive activities among the Poles living in the free world and by their espionage conducted in the free world in the interest of Moscow;

11. Condemn them for their irresponsible attacks against the people of the United States for whom the Polish nation has a great regard and shows great friendship;

12. Demand that the Governments of the United States and Great Britain put the question of freedom of Poland and other countries of central-eastern Europe on the agenda of the United Nations;

13. Demand that the monstrous crime committed by the Soviet Union in the Katyn Forest 25 years ago be put on the agenda of the United Nations;

14. Demand that the United States and Great Britain recognize the western border of Poland on the Oder and Neisse line as right and just, and that Polish eastern territories, grabbed by the Soviet Union, be restored to Poland;

15. Demand that the Red army and various Soviet officials be withdrawn from Poland;

16. Demand that full religious freedom be restored in Poland, that Poles still held against their will in the U.S.S.R. be repatriated from the Soviet Union to Poland, that all political prisoners be released, that freedom of speech and assembly be restored, that true local government be established, that independent political parties, cooperative, professional, youth and cultural organizations be reestablished;

17. Demand that free and democratic elections be held in Poland under the international control; and

18. Appeal to the entire Polonia and to all patriotic organizations for an absolute resistance against the attempts of Gomulka to subordinate Polonia and the political emigration to the Communist regime to frustrate their fight for freedom of Poland and against the infiltration and diversion of various open and disguised Communist agents.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we recognize the fundamental weakness of the Communist world. This weakness is dramatized by groups such as the Polish Peasant Party, which both within the country and through spokesmen in the Free World, very effectively and persistently struggles to restore legitimate freedom and progressive government to the millions of people now suffering under Communist enslavement.

A Realistic Appraisal of American Foreign Policy in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the academic community has apparently been

having a field day over the past month isolating various and sundry portions of American foreign policy in southeast Asia and heaping and compounding criticism upon the same.

American foreign policy in southeast Asia is complex but I do not believe too complex for reasonable people to analyze the facts and come to conclusions other than that suggested by academic community leader, Hans Morgenthau, that it is inevitable that communism take over southeast Asia lest there be total war with Communist China.

Assistant Secretary of State, Douglas MacArthur II has recently factually analyzed the American policy in Vietnam, I believe convincingly, in the following communication.

I would hope over the coming weeks to insert further and additional material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which would be further supportive of the American position:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, June 7, 1965.

The Honorable ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: Thank you for your letter of June 2 enclosing a letter concerning the situation in Vietnam.

Your constituent raises several points with which I must disagree. The main point seems to be that the conflict in Vietnam is a civil war. I will address myself primarily to this point. In response to the other issues that your constituent raises I am enclosing material which she should find of interest.

Far from being a civil war, the war in South Vietnam is the result of the announced attempt by the Communist regime in North Vietnam to conquer South Vietnam in violation of the 1954 Geneva accords. In Communist propaganda this form of aggression masquerades as a "war of national liberation." In reality, the war which the Vietcong are waging against the South is directed politically and militarily from Hanoi, the capital of North Vietnam. It is commanded primarily by leaders and specialists infiltrated from north of the 17th parallel. It is supplied by weapons and equipment sent by North Vietnam, which in turn is supported by Red China. Its aim is to win control of South Vietnam for communism in violation of solemn agreements and with no reference to the wishes of the South Vietnamese people.

In December 1961, the State Department thoroughly documented North Vietnam's efforts to conquer South Vietnam in its white paper entitled "A Threat to the Peace." The February 1965 State Department white paper entitled "Aggression From the North" adds documentation on how Hanoi has masterminded the Vietcong campaign in South Vietnam. The 1962 report of the International Control Commission for Vietnam spelled out North Vietnam's aggressive actions in flagrant violation of the 1954 Geneva accords and the 1962 agreement on Laos.

What Hanoi was up to then is even more apparent now. In the ICC report of February 13, 1965, the Canadian delegate to the ICC, Mr. J. B. Seaborn, says that "The events which have taken place in both North and South Vietnam since February 7 are the direct result of the intensification of the aggressive policy of the Government of North Vietnam." He points to "the continuing fact that North Vietnam has increased its efforts to incite, encourage, and support hostile activities in South Vietnam, aimed at the overthrow of the South Vietnamese administration."

In a recent network television interview, Mr. Seaborn said that perhaps even more significant than the actual numbers of North

Vietnamese infiltrators is the quality and type of people Hanoi has been sending, in that they are essentially the trained officers and specialists who serve as the backbone of the Vietcong movement.

Another aspect of this is that within the last year Hanoi has been sending primarily native-born North Vietnamese to fight in the south. From 1959 until last year, North Vietnam primarily utilized a pool of South Vietnamese who had fought with the Viet Minh against the French and went north in 1954 to become citizens of North Vietnam.

The Communists are fond of saying that whether the Vietcong are born in the north or south, they are still Vietnamese and therefore an indigenous revolt must be taking place. Certainly, they are Vietnamese, and the North Koreans who swept across their boundary in 1950 to attack South Korea were also Koreans. However, this did not make the Korean war an indigenous revolt from the point of view of either world security or in terms of acceptable standards of conduct. By the same token, if West Germany were to take similar action against East Germany, it is doubtful that the East Germans, the Soviet Union, and the rest of the Communist bloc would stand aside on the grounds that it was nothing more than an indigenous affair. The simple issue is that military personnel and arms have been sent across an international demarcation line (just as valid a border as Korea or Germany) contrary to international agreements and law to destroy the freedom of a neighboring people.

The hard core leaders and technicians serving the so-called National Liberation Front of South Vietnam are not serving the interests of the people of South Vietnam, but were sent by and are serving the interests of their masters in the north. In addition to them, there are, of course, a substantial number of South Vietnamese who, largely by terror and intimidation, have been recruited into the Vietcong movement.

But, as the President recently put it, Hanoi's support of the Vietcong is the heartbeat of the war. It is for that reason, and because Hanoi has stepped up its aggression that the Government of South Vietnam and the United States have been forced to increase our response and strike through the air at the true source of the aggression—North Vietnam. This does not represent a change of purpose on our part—but a change in the means we believe are necessary to stem aggression.

Prior to our stepped up assistance to South Vietnam in 1961 in response to increasing aggressive actions against the South, U.S. military aid to South Vietnam was carried out within the limits imposed by the 1954 Geneva Accords.

It was in response to North Vietnamese violations of the Accords (documented in 1962 by the ICC in Vietnam and reconfirmed by the February 13, 1965, report of the Canadian delegation to the ICC) that the United States responded to the Government of Vietnam's request for stepped-up assistance to help defend itself. We believe our aid is justified in view of North Vietnam's flagrant violations of its obligations under the 1954, and 1962 (Laos) Geneva agreements.

The liberation front is no more than just that—a front for North Vietnam's aggressive campaign against South Vietnam. It has no legal basis under international law, no real support from the people of South Vietnam and no ability to survive without continuing support from North Vietnam and other Communist nations. It was Hanoi's creation in 1960 and to this day Hanoi is directing and supplying it with its essential men and material.

Some individuals are concerned that the Government of South Vietnam does not represent the people; we would like to point out, however, that there is more evidence to

show that the Government of the Republic of Vietnam is based on the consent of the people under its jurisdiction than is the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. There is a free and open exchange of ideas in South Vietnam; political parties, trade unions and religious groups, among others, not only exist and express independent opinions but have a definite influence on governmental policies. Nothing of this sort is evident in North Vietnam; nor are there indications there of freedom of the press or assembly, a striking contrast with the situation in South Vietnam.

The attitude of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam toward communism is unmistakable: even though there has been a series of governmental revisions since the fall of the Diem government in November 1963, every administration has operated from a basic policy of anticommunism, and a staunch determination to continue the struggle against Communist aggression. The South Vietnamese people themselves have given undeniable evidence of their allegiance by "voting with their feet"—since the beginning of this year, approximately 200,000 have become refugees, choosing to abandon their homes and leave the Vietcong-controlled areas in the north central portion of South Vietnam. The close to one million persons who fled from North Vietnam to the South after the Communists assumed control are more impressive testimony still to the allegiance of the Vietnamese people.

We do not find any significant body of people or opinion in South Vietnam among these 14 million people, other than the Vietcong themselves, who are looking to Hanoi for guidance. The Vietcong use the old instrument of terror to induce passivity. As a result, in those areas which have been secured and cleared, there is no problem about the cooperation of the people in South Vietnam when they can be given reasonable assurance that their cooperation will not lead to their throats being slit on the following night. In addition, when one speaks about the attitudes of the villagers, one must remember that these people want to live lives in decency and security, grow their own crops, raise their families, and improve their land if they can. And they are not asking the north for the answer.

As a result of the 1954 Geneva accords, South Vietnam as well as North Vietnam is an international entity with independent international status. Under those Accords, Vietnam was temporarily divided into two separate zones each to be administered by the authorities in North and South Vietnam, respectively, until the unification of the country. The accords, then, endowed both North and South Vietnam with separate and distinct status. For example, diplomatic or consular relations have been established with Saigon or Hanoi or both.¹

At the same time, the provisional military demarcation line established by the Geneva Accords, although not a "political or territorial boundary," is still an international frontier that must be respected under inter-

national law. In this respect the division of Vietnam is similar to the division of Germany or Korea. It is obvious that if a state is divided by an internationally recognized demarcation line, each part of that state must refrain from the use of force or hostile acts against the other. Thus, an attack by North Korea on South Korea or East Germany on West Germany would be illegal. Such attacks are no less aggression or armed attack than an attack by one state against another.

The point about the French failure to win in Vietnam is one that is often heard, but has little application to the present situation. The French were fighting to preserve some sort of continued French Union presence in Vietnam and actually exercised military command over the Vietnamese forces; we are assisting the Vietnamese in their own fight to preserve their independence and way of life against Communist imperialism and are ready to pull out once our help is no longer needed.

If I may be of any further assistance to you, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Traffic Relief Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting public service program is being developed in New York by Robert Joseph, a prominent real estate executive, in cooperation with the United Taxi Owners Guild, and many leading New York citizens.

The program seeks to develop new suggestions aimed at traffic relief. Inasmuch as the problem of growing traffic congestion relates to all of our urban areas, I would like to have the following material placed on record detailing some of the efforts of private individuals to curb mounting traffic congestion.

Traffic congestion threatens to strangle the economic life of New York and something practical must be done about it—with this in mind, a group of prominent real estate executives, public officials, civic and business leaders have organized a traffic relief contest to be run on an annual basis.

Robert Joseph, chairman of Robert Joseph & Co., Inc., a real estate firm, conceived of the contest and helped organize it. His company is posting \$500 in prizes to help stimulate specific and imaginative solutions to the traffic dilemma. Cosponsor of the contest is the 2,000-member United Taxi Owners Guild.

The contest will be open to any licensed real estate broker or salesman and to licensed taxicab drivers and owners. The entrant must submit in writing a description of his idea on how to help ease the traffic problem. The idea can involve a limited intersection or traffic artery, or may span a large geographic area.

The entries must be submitted on or before June 15. They must be no more than 500 words in length, and must pertain to any or all of the five boroughs of the city.

The entries are to be submitted to Assemblyman Alfred A. Lama, 395 Pearl Street, Brooklyn. Mr. Lama has accepted the position of secretary of the committee.

The first prize will be \$300 in cash; the second prize, \$200, and both will be presented at a luncheon.

Members of the panel of judges include: State Senator Thomas J. Mackell, Democrat, of Queens; State Senator Frederic S. Berman, Democrat, of Manhattan; City Councilman Thomas J. Cuite, Democrat, of Brooklyn; Assemblywoman Aileen B. Ryan, Democrat, of Bronx; Congressman JOHN M. MURPHY, Democrat, of Brooklyn-Staten Island; Herman B. Glaser, president of the New York State Association of Trial Lawyers; Leon Teuch and Salvatore Baron, president and executive manager respectively of the United Taxi Owners Guild; and State Senator Guy James Manago, Democrat, of Brooklyn.

The traffic suggestions will be offered to the city as a public service in an effort to focus attention on the problem and in an attempt to develop worthwhile ideas that could lead to an improvement in traffic control.

The city, under Commissioner Barnes, has done a heroic job and the committee feels that the citizens who have a stake in seeing that traffic congestion is eased, can offer much in terms of good concepts.

The cabdriver and the real estate man live with this problem everyday, and their attention to the problem may prove extremely rewarding to the city.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

¹ The Republic of Vietnam has de jure diplomatic relations with 52 nations including France, United Kingdom, West Germany, Brazil, Mexico, Switzerland, and Ethiopia. North Vietnam has full diplomatic relations with 24 countries, 12 of whom belong to the Communist bloc. This recognition ratio is comparable to South Korea which has full relations with 64 nations while North Korea is recognized by 25. West Germany has de jure recognition from nearly 100 nations while East Germany has full diplomatic relations with only 12.

As far back as 1955, South Vietnam was recognized, de jure, by 36 nations, and North Vietnam had full relations with 12 countries.